



1965

An Historical Study Of The Adoption Of The Fifth-Year Requirement For High School Certification In California

Calvin Richard Boyes
University of the Pacific

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Boyes, Calvin Richard. (1965). *An Historical Study Of The Adoption Of The Fifth-Year Requirement For High School Certification In California*. University of the Pacific, Dissertation. https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds/2857

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of the Pacific Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact mgibney@pacific.edu.

AN HISTORICAL STUDY OF THE ADOPTION OF THE FIFTH-YEAR
REQUIREMENT FOR HIGH SCHOOL CERTIFICATION
IN CALIFORNIA

A Dissertation
Presented to
The Faculty of the School of Education
University of the Pacific

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements of the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
Calvin Richard Boyes

June 1965

This dissertation is approved for recommendation
to the Graduate Council.

Department Chairman or Dean:

J. Marc Jantzen

Dissertation Committee:

J. Marc Jantzen, Chairman

Malcolm R. Eiselen

Ronald Rues

Carl D. Lang

Raein C. Fox

Dated May 4, 1965

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people were most helpful in locating and making available the materials needed in this study. These included: the library staffs of The University of the Pacific; Sacramento State College; The University of California; Stanford University; Teachers College, Columbia University; The California State Library, Sacramento; The Research Library of the California Teachers Association, Burlingame; the Research Department of the California State Department of Education, Sacramento; and the office of the California State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Sacramento.

The help of my doctoral committee and especially its Chairman Dean J. Marc Jantzen of the School of Education was most appreciated in selecting, defining, delimitating, developing, and refining the study.

Last, but not least, I wish to acknowledge the patience and understanding of my loving wife, Eileen, who inspired me throughout the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE STUDY, PROCEDURES AND SOURCES OF	
INFORMATION	1
The Study	1
Purpose of the Study	1
Delimitations	2
Survey of Literature	3
Procedure	6
Sources of Information	6
II. A BRIEF HISTORY OF SECONDARY EDUCATION IN	
CALIFORNIA	8
Early Development of Secondary Education . . .	8
The Role of Denominational and Private	
Secondary Schools	11
Legislation includes High Schools in the	
School System	11
Rapid Growth of High Schools 1874-1879 . . .	12
Period of Loss of State Financial Support . . .	12
Economic and Political Changes in	
California	12
The Influence of the University of	
California on Secondary Education	16
High School Growth 1885-1900	18

CHAPTER	PAGE
State Financial Support	19
Composition of the School System in 1905 . .	23
Summary	24
III. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF CERTIFICATION IN	
CALIFORNIA	26
Introduction	26
The Examination System of Certification	27
State Control of Examination Joins Local	
Control	29
Early Use of Credentials in Place of	
Examination	33
Return to Local Control of Examination and	
Certification in 1879	36
Worth of Diploma and Faculty Recommendation	
Recognized	37
Abuses Under Local Control of Examination . .	39
The Credential Basis for Certification Arises .	40
The Certification Law of 1891	40
The Certification Law of 1893	41
Summary	43
IV. DEVELOPMENTS LEADING UP TO THE FIFTH-YEAR	
REQUIREMENT	46
Educators Recognize Need for Certification	
Reform	46

CHAPTER

PAGE

The California Teachers' Association Provides	
Leadership	50
The Weaknesses of the Examination System	
Exposed	53
Professional Teacher Education Requested	
by the State's Educators	55
Solutions Hinge on State and College Control .	57
The California Teachers' Association	
Recommends a State Controlled Credential	
System of Certification	57
California State Educational Commission	63
State Commission Recommends Credential	
System for High School Certification	
in 1900	67
New Law -- New Progress	70
Certification Law of 1901 Establishes the	
Credential System of Certification	70
State Board of Education Adopts Practice	
Teaching Requirement in 1902	72
The Content of a Sound Teacher Education	
Program was Outlined in 1902	76
Summary	79
V. ADOPTION OF THE FIFTH-YEAR REQUIREMENT	82
One Half-Year Required First	82

CHAPTER

PAGE

The University of California Requires	
One-half Year of Graduate Study	82
A Full Year of Graduate Study Recommended	
in 1903	84
State Board Requires One Half-year of	
Graduate Study	87
Full Fifth-Year Required of Secondary	
Teachers	89
Meeting of the State Board on December 4-5,	
1905	90
Adoption of the Fifth-Year Requirement . . .	92
Summary	95
VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	98
Summary	98
Factors Leading to the Fifth-Year	
Requirement	99
Conclusions	105
Principles Established by, and Reflected in,	
the Adoption of the Fifth-Year	
Requirement	105
Roles of the Various Agencies	105
Teacher Selection	107
Teaching as a Profession	107
Content of a Teacher Education Program . . .	108

CHAPTER	PAGE
Recommendations for Further Study	109
BIBLIOGRAPHY	110
APPENDIX A. California State Educational Commission	
Members Present at the San Francisco	
Meeting, April 12, 1900	117
APPENDIX B. Report to the California Educational	
Commission	119
APPENDIX C. University of California's One Half-Year	
of Graduate Study Requirement	126
APPENDIX D. California State Superintendents of	
Public Instruction	131
APPENDIX E. Minutes of the Adoption of the Fifth-Year	
Requirement	132

CHAPTER I

THE STUDY, PROCEDURES, AND SOURCES OF INFORMATION

I. THE STUDY

This is an historical study depicting how California came to adopt the requirement of a fifth year of preparation for secondary teachers. It is hoped that through a better understanding of such a milestone event those interested in teacher education will be able to view current educational problems with greater insight.

This insight should include the knowledge that California's fifth-year requirement, though being the first in the United States, was just one of the steps in the development of better certification in this State and the nation.

Through remembering how this one significant event, the adoption of the fifth-year requirement, occurred in the long evolution of certification, those interested in teacher education should find it easier to understand current and future credentialing regulations and to assess their development.

Purpose of the Study

This study of the California adoption of the initial fifth-year requirement for high school certification has the

following aims:

1. To describe briefly the development of secondary education in California in order to show the contemporary situation that existed at the time of the adoption of the fifth-year requirement for high school certification.

2. To trace and review the background of certification in California in order to provide the historical setting for the adoption of the fifth-year requirement in the over-all development of certification in the State.

3. To show the nature of professional thought and leadership that fostered the adoption of the fifth-year requirement.

4. To describe how the fifth-year requirement was adopted and by whom.

5. To draw conclusions concerning principles which were established by, and reflected in, the adoption of the fifth-year requirement.

Delimitations

California's adoption of a requirement for a fifth-year of graduate study for the secondary credential sixty years ago was a signal event. This study will deal only with the adoption of the fifth-year requirement for high school certification, along with the necessary background information as stated above. It will leave the treatment of the

history of certification and the subsequent development and practice of the fifth-year program to other studies.

II. SURVEY OF LITERATURE

A survey of studies on teacher certification, dealing both with California and the nation as a whole, revealed that no study in depth concerning the fifth-year requirement for high school certification had been made in this State. Erwin W. Von Schlichten had written such a study, "A Study in Teacher Certification: the Story of the Five Year Requirement in New York State," as an Ed.D. dissertation at Teachers' College, Columbia University.¹ Von Schlichten's dissertation differs from this study, however. His is more a study of current practice, since New York did not adopt the fifth-year requirement until 1943.

The lack of information on the origin of the fifth-year requirement in California was confirmed by personal interviews with Dr. Lucien B. Kinney, Professor Emeritus of Education at Stanford University, Dr. Charles Hamilton of the California Teachers Association, Dr. Stephen C. Clark, Director of the Research Information Center of the California

¹Erwin W. Von Schlichten, "A Study in Teacher Certification: the Story of the Five Year Requirement in New York State" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1956).

Teachers Association, Dr. Blair Hurd, Coordinator of Teacher Education of the California State Department of Education, Dr. Henry Magnuson, Head of the Research Division of the California State Department of Education, and correspondence with Dr. Henry Harap, Specialist for Fifth-year Programs of Teacher Preparation of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and author of Teacher Preparation: Fifth-year Programs. These contacts all seemed to indicate that a study of the adoption of the fifth-year requirement for secondary teachers in California would constitute a worthwhile contribution to education research.

The discussion with Dr. Kinney of Stanford was most encouraging and helpful since under his tutelage a considerable amount of educational research had been conducted, some in the area of teacher certification.

The dissertations and theses of Cain,² Chu,³ Lin,⁴ and

²Leo F. Cain, "The Development of Teacher Certification in California" (unpublished Master's thesis, Stanford University, 1935).

³Buoyman Mary Chu, "State Policies and Programs in the Certification of Teachers in California from 1890 to 1940" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1946).

⁴Henry C. Lin, "Origin and Development of Teacher Training in California" (unpublished Master's thesis, Stanford University, 1930).

Miller⁵ at Stanford, as well as those of Brown⁶ and Burkman⁷ at the University of California, Berkeley, were helpful in understanding the over-all picture of teacher certification in California. These were general historical studies, however, which did not have the purpose of studying in depth any particular facet of secondary teacher certification such as was done with the fifth-year requirement for high school teachers in this study. Archer's⁸ study was helpful in understanding current certification practices in California.

For the background and understanding of the development of teacher certification, in the United States, as well as the relationship of teacher certification to licensure among the other professions, the works of Blauch,⁹ Carr-

⁵Frank Byron Miller, "A Study of the Certification of Teachers in the State of California, 1849 to 1880" (unpublished Master's thesis, Stanford University, 1931).

⁶Sherman S. Brown, "The History of the Training and Certification of Secondary Teachers in California" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of California, Berkeley, 1931).

⁷Joel Andrew Burkmen, "Teachers' Permanent Certificates and Professional Growth" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, The University of California, Berkeley, 1931).

⁸Ellis C. Archer, "A Proposed Revision of California Credential Structure" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1956).

⁹Lloyd E. Blauch, (ed.), Education for the Professions, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1955).

Saunders and Wilson,¹⁰ Knight,¹¹ and Knight and Hall¹² were most helpful.

For an over-all reference work on all phases of the history of education in California, the book Education in California, by Roy W. Cloud, State Executive Secretary of the California Teachers Association from 1927 to 1947 is informative.¹³

III. PROCEDURE

To achieve the foregoing purposes of this study the historical research method has been used. All available information and data bearing upon the topic have been gathered and analysed. From such information and data a factual account has been written.

IV. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

The sources of information for this study have been The Constitution of the State of California; California

¹⁰A.M. Carr-Saunders and P.A. Wilson, The Professions (London: Oxford University Press, 1933).

¹¹Edgar W. Knight, Education in the United States (New York: Ginn and Company, 1951).

¹²Edgar W. Knight and Clifton L. Hall, Readings in American Educational History (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1951).

¹³Roy W. Cloud, Education in California (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1952).

Statutes enacted by the State legislature; Minutes of the California State Board of Education meetings; Proceedings of the California Teachers Association meetings; Proceedings of the County and City Superintendents' Conventions and other educational groups; Regulations of the State Department of Education; Annual and Biennial Reports of the California State Superintendents of Public Instruction; Reports of special educational commissions; and the University of California Register.

Other valuable sources of material have been articles in contemporary educational journals, books and studies on California educational history, doctoral dissertations, and masters' theses.

CHAPTER II

A BRIEF HISTORY OF SECONDARY EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA

In order for an outstanding event to occur, such as the adoption of a fifth-year requirement of graduate study for secondary teachers, the existant educational condition must be a favorable one.

It is the purpose of this chapter to show the nature of this condition by briefly describing the development of secondary education in California up to the position that it held at the time of the adoption of the fifth-year requirement.

I. EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

The first common schools in California were established during the era of Spanish and Mexican rule. These were generally of poor quality and had little effect on the later development of the schools.¹

Early American occupation of California saw some improvement in the concern for education. During this period and prior to the first Constitutional Convention, held in

¹John H. Napier, Jr., "The Origin and Development of The Public High School in California," California Quarterly of Secondary Education, VIII (January, 1933), p. 179.

1849 at Monterey, a few common schools were established in the cities. Interest in schools at this time, however, was not strong.²

Nor did interest gain during the early days of the gold rush. The population there was made up largely of men who had left their families with the intention of returning to them when they had made their fortunes. They had little use, therefore, for schools.³

Despite the unsettled conditions which existed in 1849, the framers of the first Constitution of the State of California nevertheless included provisions for education.

Article IX, section 3, states:

The Legislature shall provide for a system of schools by which a school shall be kept and supported in each district at least three months in each year, and any school district neglecting to keep up and support such a school may be deprived of its proportion of the interest of the public fund. . . .⁴

While no specific mention of high schools was made it was implied that a complete "system of schools" was to be

² Ibid., p. 183-184.

³ J.B. McChesney, "Secondary Education in California," Twenty-first Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction 1903-1904 (Sacramento: State Printing Office, 1903-1904), p. 114.

⁴ California State Constitution, adopted in 1849, Art. IX, sec. 3, p. 12.

established. The legislature was therefore required to:

" . . . encourage by all suitable means the promotion of intellectual, scientific, moral and agricultural improvement. . . ."

This indicates that all levels of public education were to be provided.⁵

The first legislature failed to respond to the educational provisions of the Constitution except that it did establish the office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. His duties were to administer the State's educational program and to encourage its development.⁶ The extent to which the State Superintendent of Public Instruction influenced this development depended upon the man himself, but in general the State Superintendents were effective leaders in educational matters, including certification, in the State. The second legislature in 1851, however, enacted the first school law. High schools were mentioned in Article II, section 5:

Not less than sixty percent of the amount paid each district shall be expended in teachers salaries; the balance may, at the discretion of the district, be expended in building or repairing school-houses, purchasing a library or apparatus, or for the support of a high school.⁷

⁵Ibid., sec. 2, p. 11.

⁶California Statutes, First Session, 1849-1850, Chap. LXXXV, Art. I, p. 205.

⁷California Statutes, Second Session, 1851- Chap. CXXVI, Art. II, sec. 5, p. 491.

No high schools were organized under the provisions of the law of 1851 for the city elementary schools were only now beginning to emerge.

The next legislature in 1852 enacted a new school law but made no mention of high schools.

The Role of Denominational and Private Secondary Schools

It was evident that secondary education in particular received scant public attention during the early years of California statehood. During this period however, and continuing until 1891, a number of denominational and private academies were established throughout the state.

These were important, not only because they provided college preparatory work during this time, but also because they blazed the trail for the public acceptance and development of secondary education.⁸

Legislation Includes High Schools in the School System

In 1855 a third school law was enacted calling for a division of the common schools into:

Primary, Grammar, and High School departments
 . . . provided, there be sufficient means for all
 such departments, and if not, then, in the order

⁸ John H. Napier, Jr., "Private Secondary Education in California, 1850-1891," California Quarterly of Secondary Education, VIII (April, 1933), p. 293.

in which they are herein named, the primary school having preference.⁹

Under this Act which prevailed until minor changes were made in 1863, the first two public high schools in California were established in San Francisco and Sacramento in 1856.¹⁰

In 1862 the thriving mining and trading centers of Nevada City and Grass Valley organized high schools.¹¹

San Jose was the next city to establish a high school and from 1869-79 eleven more were organized in Stockton, Santa Clara, Vallejo, Oakland, Marysville, Los Angeles, Petaluma, Santa Rosa, Santa Cruz, Alameda and Gilroy.¹²

These high schools developed directly out of the mixed one-room common schools. As a school grew in size it would be divided into primary, intermediate, and advanced grade or high school departments. Finally when the enrollment was sufficiently large a separate high school would emerge.¹³

⁹California Statutes, Fifth Session, 1855, Chap. CLXXXV, sec. 17, p. 234.

¹⁰California, Tenth Annual Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction 1860 (Sacramento: California State Printing Office, 1860), p. 6.

¹¹John Swett, Public Education in California (New York: American Book Co., 1911), p. 262.

¹²John A. Napier, Jr., "The Rise of the Public High School in California Prior to 1879," California Quarterly of Secondary Education, VIII (June, 1933), p. 398.

¹³Ibid.

The growth of the high school movement was abetted by the establishment in 1869 of the University of California. The presence of this institution increased the importance of the role of the high school in preparing students for higher education. The University through its entrance requirements also influenced considerably the curriculum of the high schools and the quality of their teaching.¹⁴

Rapid Growth of High Schools 1874-1879

The period from 1874 to 1879 was one of rapid growth of secondary education in California. There was nearly a doubling of the number of students enrolled in high schools, advanced grades, or advanced grammar grades (as they were sometimes called) from 2,447 in 1874 to 4,871 in 1879.¹⁵

II. PERIOD OF LOSS OF STATE FINANCIAL SUPPORT

Economic and Political Changes in California

During the 1870's the complexion of California itself was changing. The mines were becoming worked out. Many miners with little capital were turning to farming and others were migrating to the cities to find employment. These problems, together with such complications as the Chinese

¹⁴McChesney, op. cit., p. 122.

¹⁵Napier, op. cit., p. 399.

immigration, the impact of the railroad monopoly, and the effect of the national panic of 1873, led to hard times for the workingman in California. There was unrest and a new political party, the "Workingmen's Party" arose. It hoped to remedy economic conditions through a revision of the Constitution of the State.¹⁶

The result of the Constitutional revision as it concerned secondary education was to eliminate all State support to high schools.

Cloud reports that, "Mr. [John] Swett had wished to include high schools as benefiting also from the School Fund, but this was stricken out ... for fear it would antagonize the Convention." It was felt that such was the feeling of the Convention that any antagonism would prevent the rest of the educational recommendations from passing.¹⁷

Article IX, section 6 of the new Constitution read:

The public school system shall include primary and grammar schools, and such high schools, evening schools, normal schools, and technical schools as may be established by the Legislature, or by municipal or district authority; but the entire revenue derived from the State School Fund and the State school tax, shall be applied exclusively to the support of primary and grammar schools.¹⁸

¹⁶McChesney, op. cit., p. 117.

¹⁷Roy W. Cloud, Education in California (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford Univ. Press, 1952), p. 69.

¹⁸California State Constitution, adopted in 1879, Art. IX, sec. 6, p. 303.

Friends of secondary education in the state were "terribly disappointed" that high schools were to receive no state financial support.¹⁹ High schools were mentioned in the Constitution but were required to seek their support from municipal or local taxation.

The inimicality in the law proved helpful to secondary education, however, by focusing people's attention more sharply on the high schools.²⁰

Since it was now the responsibility of the local community to support a high school if they wanted one, the people examined the benefits that having a high school could bring them. They looked to existing high schools to see what they were doing for their communities.²¹ The result of this type of action was that new high schools were formed and according to McChesney, none was abandoned as a result of the new Constitution.²²

Secondary education received an increasing share of attention from the State teachers' associations at teachers' institutes and from visiting lecturers from the University of California and other colleges. This consideration helped

¹⁹McChesney, op. cit., p. 118.

²⁰Ibid., p. 119.

²¹Ibid.

²²Ibid.

the high schools to provide a better program.

Recognizing the worth of a high school education but desiring State aid to support it, some communities devised a plan to get both. They adopted an extension of their grammar schools and called it the "grammar course." It included enough English, mathematics, science, and history to secure for its students admission to some colleges in the State. This plan worked for a period with the State appropriating three dollars for each pupil so enrolled.²⁴

In 1891 the subterfuge was termed illegal thus closing this avenue of State support for the high schools.²⁵

However the legislature did pass an Act in 1891 that aided small districts to secure high schools. It authorized the establishment of union high schools by contiguous districts which were too small to support a high school on their own. This led to a growth in the number of high schools particularly in the rural areas.²⁶

The people of California, however, still saw the "incongruity" of laws that supported both ends of the educational system, i.e. elementary schools and the University,

²³Ibid.

²⁴Ibid., p. 120.

²⁵California Statutes, Twenty-ninth Session, 1891, Chapter CXXXVII, sec. 2, p. 182.

²⁶Ibid.

but did not support the high schools in the middle.²⁷

The Influence of the University of California on Secondary Education

In 1884 the University of California started a movement which was to influence the high schools, and particularly their curricula, to a greater extent than was currently being done through its entrance requirements. The University adopted the "accrediting system" whereby pupils from high schools accredited by the University could be admitted to the University without examination.

Examiners from the University visited high schools throughout the State to observe their programs and examine their curricula to determine whether they should or should not be accredited.

This accrediting, together with University extension courses, did much to acquaint the public with the roles and the values of both the University and the high schools.²⁸

The National Education Association was becoming an influence in California education as early as 1888 when San Francisco was chosen as the site of the National Education Association Convention for that year.²⁹ Cloud reports that

²⁷McChesney, op. cit., p. 120.

²⁸Ibid., p. 122.

²⁹Cloud, op. cit., p. 94.

The entire convention was an inspirational treat to the teachers of the West, most of whom were privileged to attend a great national convention for the first time.³⁰

The influence of this group on secondary education was manifested at the National Education Association meeting in 1892 when a resolution was adopted which aided secondary education throughout the country. The resolution was directed toward making college entrance requirements more uniform. A committee referred to as "the committee of ten," was appointed to study the problem and to make recommendations.³¹

At a subsequent National Education Association meeting, a committee, which came to be known as "the committee of fifteen" was appointed to continue the work. Their findings were used by high schools in California to improve their offerings and to generate increased interest in the high schools.³²

Another factor which aided the growth of high schools was the provision in the new Constitution which guaranteed women admission to the University of California. Included in Article IX, section 9, was the following statement: "No

³⁰ Ibid., p. 95.

³¹ National Education Association, Proceedings of the National Education Association Convention of 1892 (Saratoga Springs, New York: The Association), p. 247.

³² McChesney, op. cit., p. 123.

person shall be debarred to any of the collegiate departments of the University on account of sex."³³

This meant more and larger high schools would be needed to make room for girls who wished to prepare for the University or who desired a high school education.

High School Growth 1885-1900

Secondary education continued its growth as indicated by these figures showing the number of high schools in the State for the period 1885 to 1900.³⁴

<u>Year</u>	<u>Total Number of High Schools</u>	<u>Number Accredited</u>		
		<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>	<u>Total</u>
1885	12	3	0	3
1890	24	11	2	13
1895	98	43	14	57
1900	120	87	23	110

Despite this growth of high schools the supporters of secondary education still strove to gain financial support for them. Their attitude was aptly expressed by State Superintendent Thomas J. Kirk:

With the advanced and advancing demands of the times, with the necessity in all fields of industrial and commercial activity for more skill and finer training, to say nothing of the demands for the culture side of life, there is a settled conviction in the minds of thoughtful friends of public education that a link is missing in our

³³California State Constitution, adopted 1879, Art. IX, sec. 9, p. 305.

³⁴McChesney, op. cit., p. 124.

educational chain, a rung out of our educational ladder, that reaches from the kindergarten through the university. The high school, therefore, has been seeking that recognition which has heretofore been denied it. High Schools, it is true, have been increasing and flourishing, not in any degree because of but in spite of the lack of State recognition. At present their attitude is largely that of private instead of public schools. They are maintained entirely by local or district tax. The State extends them no aid whatever. School superintendents and other officials are not certain how the High School teachers and pupils are to be counted in making reports of the teaching force and of enrollment and daily attendance in public schools. An outgrowth of this condition and of the sentiment in favor of high schools so common among the people is the pending constitutional amendment designated as No. 4, which is to be voted upon at the ensuing general election.³⁵

III. STATE FINANCIAL SUPPORT

The teachers of California had met together as early as 1854, when State Superintendent Paul K. Hubbs called the first State teacher's convention.³⁶ Subsequent teacher's conventions and institutes led to the founding, in 1863, during the State Superintendentship of John Swett, of the California Educational Society.³⁷ This Society, according to Cloud, "wielded... much educational power," and was "a

³⁵ Thomas J. Kirk, "State Recognition of High Schools," Twentieth Biennial Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction 1901-1902 (Sacramento: California State Printing Office, 1901-1902), p. 11.

³⁶ Cloud, op. cit., p. 52.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 56.

dynamic force in the school life of the State."³⁸

In 1875 the California Teachers Association was formed from the base provided by the California Educational Society.³⁹ The new organization, observed Cloud, "proved itself to be a great, State-wide, all-inclusive educational body, which worked for the welfare of the teachers and the protection of the rights of the [students] of California."⁴⁰

The California Teachers Association was in favor of the proposed amendment to provide State financial support to the high schools and this support, together with a general public demand for State support of the high schools lead to its passage by the voters in 1902.⁴¹

The amendment which was adopted to Article IX, section 6, of the Constitution of California reads as follows:

The public school system shall include primary and grammar schools, and such high schools, evening schools, normal schools, and technical schools as may be established by the Legislature, or by municipal or district authority. The entire revenue derived from the State school fund and from the general State school tax shall be applied exclusively to the support of primary and grammar schools; but the Legislature may authorize and cause to be levied a special State school tax for the support of high schools and technical schools,

³⁸ Ibid., p. 58.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Cloud, op. cit., p. 103.

or either of such schools, included in the public school system, and all revenue derived from such special tax shall be applied exclusively to the support of the schools for which such special tax shall be levied.⁴²

Superintendent Kirk, as chronicled by Cloud, called together a committee to draft a legislative proposal to provide State aid to the high schools under terms of the new amendment. The committee membership included Elmer E. Brown, Professor of Education at the University of California and later United States Commissioner of Education from 1906 to 1911, and J.W. McClymonds, Oakland City Schools Superintendent.⁴³

Professor Brown had added a young southern California high school principal, David Rhys Jones, to the education staff at the University. Since Mr. Jones was currently also writing a Master's thesis on "State Aid to Secondary Schools," Professor Brown brought him to the committee meetings. Mr. Jones was asked to study materials gathered by the California Teachers' Association and to draft a bill to be presented to the Legislature.⁴⁴

Superintendent Kirk gave this draft to his friend Chester Rowell of Fresno who introduced the bill and guided

⁴² California State Constitution, amendment adopted November 4, 1902 to Art. IX, sec. 6, p. lvi.

⁴³ Cloud, loc. cit.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

it through both houses in 1903.⁴⁵ The bill provided for an ad valorem tax of $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents on every one hundred dollars of taxable property in the state to support high schools.⁴⁶

In the passage of this act Elmer E. Brown saw an impetus for high school growth in California. At the northern section meeting of the California Teachers Association, held at Willows in 1903, he commented:

This act, based upon the Constitutional Amendment adopted a year ago, provides for State aid to high schools. Our high schools have had to do without such aid since the adoption of the Constitution of 1879. The new (Rowell) act provides for the distribution of State aid in very considerable amounts. It seems likely that it will give a great impetus to the building up of high schools in parts of the State not already well provided with such schools. A great movement is underway in various parts of the country looking to the provision of free high school instruction to all children in a given state who are qualified to receive such instruction. Ten states I believe have now such provision, the last of which is California. Parallel with this movement there has been a tremendous increase in the enrollment of pupils in high schools. In the country at large, nearly one per cent of the whole population is now enrolled in such schools. In nineteen States more than one per cent of the population is enrolled in secondary schools. According to the latest report of the Commissioner of Education, California leads all of the states in the proportion of its population enrolled in colleges and universities. But in the proportion of its population enrolled in secondary schools California is far down the list - the fourteenth from the top. This means that at the

⁴⁵Ibid.

⁴⁶California Statutes, Thirty-fifth Session, 1903, Chapter LX, sec. 1, p. 64.

present time a very high proportion of the students in our secondary schools is made up of those preparing for college. We cannot expect so high a proportion to be maintained with the great increase in schools and attendance which will, undoubtedly, come under the operation of the Rowell Act. It follows that this Act will be chiefly of benefit to that very large class of pupils who might go to secondary schools, under favorable conditions, but will not be able to go to college. In view of this fact it should command the hearty interest of all who are interested in education in the common schools, whether they are also interested in higher education or not.⁴⁷

As Professor Brown predicted public secondary education continued to grow. In 1902 there were 139 high schools in the state, 143 in 1903, and by 1905 there were 177.⁴⁸

The University of California continued to exert a strong influence upon the high schools through its accreditation and its entrance requirements. The curriculum was broadening, however, to provide for local desires and for those students who were not to go on to higher education.⁴⁹

Composition of the School System in 1905

At the time of the adoption of the fifth-year requirement for high school certification the educational system of

⁴⁷Elmer E. Brown, "Address," California Teachers' Association, Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Session of the Northern Section Nov. 1903 (Willows, Calif.: Colusa Sun Job Rooms, 1903), p. 26.

⁴⁸McChesney, op. cit., p. 124, and Twenty-Second Biennial Report, State Supt. of Public Instruction, 1905-1906, p. 81.

⁴⁹McChesney, Ibid., p. 126.

California was State supported and composed of the elementary schools requiring eight years (four years for primary and four years for the grammar department), the high schools four years, the universities four years, and the professional schools four years.

Summary

An environment in secondary education which would be conducive to the adoption of a fifth-year of preparation for high school teachers developed early in California despite an inauspicious beginning.

Prior to statehood there was little interest in schools except in a few of the cities. The first State Constitution of 1849 authorized the legislature to establish a school system but it was not until 1856 that the first public schools were established.

During these early years the denominational and private high schools provided secondary education for the state and paved the way for the acceptance of the public high school.

With the granting of State financial support to high schools in 1855 together with the establishment of the University of California in 1869, the development of high schools was accelerated and by 1879 there were 4,871 students enrolled in secondary schools in the State.

Economic changes took place in California with the

playing out of the mines and a conversion to farming, commerce and more domestic pursuits. The resultant upheaval led to political changes also, with the workingmen of California seeking to improve their lot through revision of the Constitution.

The public high schools still continued to increase in the State, however, due to heightened interest in them at a local level and to the authorization passed in 1891, to form union high schools.

The need for state financial aid nevertheless was necessary to the development of the type of a secondary system which educators advocated and which the accrediting system of the University of California demanded. It was recognized also, that the state supported the educational system from elementary school through the University except for the high schools.

In 1903, the passage of the Rowell Act, under provisions of a Constitutional amendment approved by the people of the State in 1902, gave state tax support to the high schools. This resulted in increased growth of high schools until in 1905 there were 177 in California.

With the State school system including a publicly financed program, the educational environment was one that could permit the adoption of a fifth-year requirement for high school teachers.

CHAPTER III

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF CERTIFICATION IN CALIFORNIA

I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter outlines the historical background of certification of high school teachers in California through the events which formed the base for the adoption of the fifth-year requirement. It is a study of certification regulations and the developing use of credentials based on education rather than examinations, as the basis for the issuance of certificates. Thus the chapter deals with the period up to and including the certification law of 1893. This background is necessary in order to show the origin and early growth of the roots from which the fifth-year idea was to develop.

Two terms, certificate and credentials, will be used in this chapter and their meanings should be made clear. By a certificate is meant a legal document authorizing a person to teach. This document or license might be issued by any legal agency ranging from local school district authorities or county authorities to state authorities, depending upon the provisions of the laws in force at the time. The certificate might be granted directly to a person with or without the issuing authority making any determination

as to the applicant's qualification to teach. It might instead be based on requirements such as an examination. It might also be based on credentials which are formal qualifications to teach that the person has attained. These credentials may be based on a college diploma or on other requirements set by the agency granting the credentials. The legal agency issuing the certificate may also prescribe regulations concerning the credentials that it will accept for certification.¹

The Constitution of the state authorizes the legislature to make provisions for education in the state. The legislature enacts basic regulations concerning certification and also empowers the State Board of Education, or County or local boards of education, to establish requirements. These boards, under the powers granted, then determine the rules and regulations for certification within their spheres of jurisdiction.

II. THE EXAMINATION SYSTEM OF CERTIFICATION

As was indicated in the preceding chapter, the Constitution of California, 1849, did make some provision for education in the State. The legislature, it was pointed out, established the office of the State Superintendent of

¹Burkman, op. cit., p. 47, and Archer, op. cit., p. 35.

Public Instruction in 1850.

In 1851 the legislature provided for the annual election of a School Committee, in each school district to, among other duties, examine and appoint teachers. The law stated as follows:

They [the Committee] shall not furnish any person a certificate unless he have a good moral character, and should be found, on a rigid examination, possessed of knowledge and that aptness to teach, which are indispensably necessary to a Teacher of youth.²

In 1852 the State Board of Education was created. The duties of the board at this time did not include certification but this function was increasingly assigned to it and it became an extremely important and influential body in the development and centralization of certification.³

A new school law was enacted in 1855. Concerning teacher certification it empowered city boards to examine teachers and to grant certificates.

. . . to each as they shall find, after rigid and thorough examination and investigation to be persons of good moral character, of sufficient learning and ability for teaching, having special regard for the ability to impart knowledge. . .

²California Statutes, Second Session, 1851, Chapter CXXVI, Article IV, secs. 5 and 6, p. 496.

³California Statutes, Third Session, 1852, Chapter LIII, Article I, sec. 1, pp. 117-118.

such certificates shall remain in force. . .
one year . . . unless sooner revoked.⁴

That each city board had freedom to establish its own requirements, indicated that the prevailing principle was one of decentralized authority for issuance of certificates. The examination system was employed and the examining board was the local board itself, made up of laymen.

State Control of Examination Joins Local Control

This unprofessional system of certification prevailed until 1860 when the unsatisfactory lay boards were replaced by state and county boards of examination. This marked a move toward both centralization of certification, and professional control of the examination itself. The power of the State Board of Examination was evident in the law which provided:

A certificate granted by said Board shall be in full force and effect, without further examination, in each and every county of the State, for a period of two years.⁵

The law was clarified and expanded in 1863, under the guidance of John Swett, State Superintendent of Public

⁴California Statutes, Sixth Session, 1855, Chapter CLXXXV, sec. 16, p. 233.

⁵California Statutes, Eleventh Session, 1860, Chapter CCCXXIX, sec. 12, p. 326.

Instruction. The new law specified that First Grade Certificates, (which were valid in high school) would be issued by the State Examining Board. This board would be composed of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, not less than three county superintendents of schools and, under the new law, "not less than four" classroom teachers.⁶ These State certificates were valid, "in any school district in the State,"⁷ and for a period of four years. Certificates based on county boards of examination were also authorized but these were valid for only two years.

A new state certificate was also created called the State Educational Diploma. It was issued on State examination of teachers who "have been engaged in the vocation of teaching at least three years."⁸ It was valid statewide for six years.

The examinations for these State certificates were held in San Francisco in connection with the annual State Teachers' Institute. The State Board of Examination, in 1863, included seven county superintendents and six teachers in addition to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

⁶California Statutes, Fourteenth Session, 1863, CLIX, sec. 47, p. 206.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Ibid., sec. 48, p. 207.

Seventy-seven candidates took the twelve- to sixteen-hour examination which included algebra, arithmetic, geography, grammar, physiology, philosophy, United States history, definition of 25 words, spelling 25 words, and general questions on methods of teaching.⁹

Candidates were granted certificates according to the scores they achieved on the examination. Candidates scoring 75 per cent or higher who had three years of teaching experience were granted State Educational Diplomas. A score of 65 per cent or higher entitled the candidate to a First Grade Certificate which was valid for four years in grammar and high schools. Second and Third Grade Certificates, valid for two years and only in grammar schools, were awarded on marks of 50 per cent and 40 per cent respectively.¹⁰

The examination resulted in the awarding of nine State Educational Diplomas, seven First Grade, ten Second Grade, and twenty Third Grade Certificates. The remaining thirty-one candidates did not pass the examination.¹¹

It was not clear at first if State Educational Diplomas were to be valid in high schools but this authorization

⁹California, Thirteenth Annual Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1863, pp. 26-27.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 28.

¹¹Ibid., p. 29.

was specified in the law of 1866. It stated that holders of this certificate were eligible to teach in any public school, including high school, except that it did not authorize the holder to teach a foreign language in high school.¹²

The 1866 law also created the State Life Diploma. To be eligible to receive this life certificate a teacher must have "taught one year successfully after receiving a State Educational Diploma."¹³

The law did not indicate whether or not this certificate entitled its holder to teach in a high school. According to Brown it was generally accepted statewide that it was a valid high school certificate. A San Francisco attorney who studied the law, at the request of San Francisco school officials, supported this opinion and the practice of allowing State Life Diploma holders to teach in the high schools of that city was followed.¹⁴

This life certificate was the highest that the State offered and still it did not require any professional training or even attendance at any school. This shows the low

¹²California Statutes, Sixteenth Session, 1865-66, CCCXLII, sec. 87, p. 404-406.

¹³Ibid., sec. 89, p. 405.

¹⁴Sherman S. Brown, "The History of the Training and Certification of Secondary Teachers in California" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, The University of California, Berkeley, 1931), p. 19.

standards that were prevalent at the time under the examination system.¹⁵

City boards of examination were also created by the law of 1866. They were to include teachers in their membership and were empowered to grant certificates for teaching in high schools.

Two more provisions of this law were indicative of the move toward statewide unanimity of certification practices. City boards of examination were permitted to grant comparable certificates, without examination, to holders of certificates issued by other city boards of examination. Furthermore, city boards were compelled by the law to honor certificates issued by the State.¹⁶

Early Use of Credentials in Place of Examination

A final important enactment in 1866 illustrated the early provision for the use of credentials in place of examination as a basis for certification. This provision stated:

All regularly issued State Normal School diplomas from any State Normal School in the United States, and all life diplomas granted by the State Board of Examination in any of the

¹⁵Ibid., p. 20.

¹⁶California Statutes, Sixteenth Session, 1866, CCCXLII, sec. 93, p. 407.

United States, shall be recognized by the State Board of Examination of this State as prima facie evidence of fitness for the profession of teaching; and the said Board shall, on application of the holders thereof, proceed to issue without examination, State Certificates, the grade to be fixed at the option of the Board.¹⁷

This law is interesting and noteworthy for its nationwide reciprocity provision. It also recognizes the worth of a diploma as a credential upon which the issuance of a certificate may be based. Further reciprocity was evidenced in 1876 when county boards of examination were granted the authority to recognize the certificates of other counties.¹⁸

Despite this reciprocity throughout the State and despite the increasing influence of the State Examination Board, there existed nevertheless, two systems of certification. One system was local in nature and included the city boards of examination and the county boards. The other system was of course that of the State Examination Board.

Thus the direction of movement toward centralized state control of certification was evident, but the local boards of examination also remained in power to grant teaching certificates.

The move toward centralization was to be stymied by

¹⁷Ibid., sec. 89, p. 405.

¹⁸California Statutes, Twenty-first Session, 1876, Chapter DXXIII, sec. 1, p. 29.

public repudiation of State examinations arising from widespread scandals in their administration. State Superintendent of Public Instruction Fred M. Campbell described the situation in his annual report.

The original provision [Law of 1866] authorized the State Board to issue Certificates on the result of examination by county boards.¹⁹

This was a good provision if the county boards would not abuse it. In 1872, however, local boards were required to use exclusively examinations sent out by the State Board of Examiners. "Then the trouble began," continued Campbell. "The questions were sometimes difficult. It was not easy to obtain a certificate."²⁰ Copies of examination questions were obtained from various sources, including the printer's office and finally the matter culminated in the San Francisco scandal in 1878.

For several years prior to 1878 there had been rumors and indications that there was corruption in the State examination system. Each time a loophole would appear, State Superintendent Ezra S. Carr would take steps to preserve the integrity of the system. At first counties gave the examinations on different days, so candidates would go from one

¹⁹California, Ninth Biennial Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1880, p. 18.

²⁰Ibid.

county to another until they could make a score high enough to qualify them for a certificate. This practice was halted by holding all examinations on the same day.²¹

When Superintendent Carr learned that copies of the questions were leaking out he appointed John Swett to the chairmanship of the State Examining Board. They had the questions printed on several presses in San Francisco but when the questions still leaked out John Swett resigned his position.²²

Superintendent Carr then purchased a press and printed the questions himself at home. All county officials handling the sealed envelopes containing the examinations and all examinees were required to take an oath of honesty. On the evening before the examination in 1878 a San Francisco newspaper printed the complete next day's examination which its editor had purchased by posing as a teacher.²³

The exposure of such corruption led to public distrust and to the downfall of a centralized State examination as the chief method of certification.

Return to Local Control of Examination and Certification in 1879

²¹Sherman S. Brown, op. cit., p. 25.

²²Ibid., p. 27.

²³Ibid., p. 29.

The State Constitution was revised in 1879 in response to the economic and social pressures of the time. The distrust of strong central State government that led to its adoption was manifest in the document itself and nowhere more clearly than in the area of education.²⁴

Decentralization was the keynote in teacher certification particularly. The Constitution stated that local boards and county boards ". . . shall have control of the examination of teachers, and the granting of teachers' certificates. . . ."²⁵

Along these lines the State Board of Education lost most of its power and became an advisory body under provisions passed by the Legislature in 1880.²⁶ The board still issued State Educational Diplomas as before but they were based upon certificates granted by county or city boards of examination rather than State examinations which were abolished.²⁷

Worth of Diploma and Faculty Recommendation Recognized

An amendment to the law in 1881 is most significant

²⁴McChesney, op. cit., p. 116.

²⁵Constitution of California, adopted in 1879, Art. IX, sec. 7, p. 303.

²⁶California Statutes, Twenty-third Session, 1880, Chapter XLIV, sec. 1, p. 29.

²⁷Ibid., p. 31.

to this study. Under its provisions both county and city boards were authorized to issue, without examination, certificates to holders of life diplomas, California Educational Diplomas, California Normal School Diplomas and "State University diplomas, when recommended by the faculty of the University."²⁸

This last phrase, concerning issuance of certificates on the basis of a University diploma, applied the use of credentials, in the form of a University education, as a basis for certification. This use of credentials rather than examinations, which was previously noted in the law of 1866, was to become increasingly advocated as being the basis for certification and was to be a vital factor of course in the adoption of the fifth-year program.

Another important concept is that the diploma had to be accompanied by a recommendation to teach from the faculty of the University. This authority to withhold its recommendation gave to the university the power to prescribe the type of education it deemed each teacher should possess.

As outlined in the previous Chapter many communities during the 1880's circumvented the loss of State support to high schools by establishing lengthened grammar school

²⁸California Statutes, Twenty-fourth Session, 1881, Chapter XLV, sec. 16, p. 45.

courses. In order to provide certified teachers for these grammar school courses, the Legislature in 1887 empowered county boards to issue, upon examination, a grammar school course certificate. This certificate, "valid for four years, [authorized the holder] to teach in any high school, grammar school course, grammar grade, and primary school."²⁹

Abuses Under Local Control of Examination

The control of certification by county and city boards was not proving to be any more free of faults and corruption than had the State system of examination. There was growing dissatisfaction with these examination boards which were in most cases composed of teachers with little more education than the candidates themselves possessed.³⁰

This type of certification by such boards lowered the respectability of the certificates they issued. Dishonesty was rampant again but was less noticeable since it was on a local scale.³¹ Each county tried to force acceptance of its certificates on other counties by recognizing certificates only from those counties that recognized their certificates. The emphasis in the examinations was on subject matter in

²⁹California Statutes, Twenty-seventh Session, 1887, Chapter CVII, sec. 8, p. 129.

³⁰Brown, op. cit., p. 41.

³¹Ibid., p. 44.

the examinations. Cramming schools flourished and it was common for county officials to let the questions leak out.³²

III. THE CREDENTIAL BASIS FOR CERTIFICATION ARISES

State Superintendent Ira G. Hoitt, in viewing these abuses, urged a return to State control of certification but based on credentials rather than examinations. "Education will have found its Utopia," he observed, "when a license showing professional training shall be required from every teacher."³³

The Certification Law of 1891

New progress toward Superintendent Hoitt's "Utopia" was made in a new certification law in 1891. Under this legislation earlier beginnings of the use of credentials as a basis for the issuance of certificates were further developed. County and city boards were given the option of granting certificates based upon diplomas or documents prescribed by the law.³⁴ Local authorities were still in

³²Ibid., p. 43.

³³Ira G. Hoitt, "Certificates," Fourteenth Biennial Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1889-1890, p. 26.

³⁴Statutes of California, Twenty-ninth Session, 1891, Chapter CXXIX, sec. 23, p. 163.

control of high school certification but this law was a definite indication of the increasing use of credentials as the basis for certification.

It is worthy of note that this law also provided that:

In cities having special departments in their schools the holders (of certificates based on credentials) may be examined by the City Board of Examination in the special studies of such departments.³⁵

This indicates that although University and Normal School diplomas could be accepted for certification they did not assure a city board that the holders were sufficiently prepared to teach in special departments without examination. The retention of examinations by city boards indicates the need for subject matter competence in teaching in the larger high schools.

The Certification Law of 1893

The 1893 session of the legislature "was friendly to the schools and passed a number of [education] bills. . . ." according to Cloud's observation.³⁶ Its enactments concerning high school certification were especially significant.

There was further movement to return to centralized State authority. The State Board of Education was empowered

³⁵Ibid.

³⁶Roy W. Cloud, Education in California (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1952), p. 90.

to specify the conditions upon which county boards were to accept recommendations for the granting of certificates without examination. The accepted standard for this recommendation was now to be a University diploma from any institution deemed by the State Board to be equal to the University of California, when it was accompanied by a faculty recommendation showing that the candidate "has had academic and professional training equivalent to that required by the State University."³⁷

Recognition of the need for both academic and professional education in the preparation of teachers was thus expressed. The value of professional education was further emphasized when the law stated that a holder of a University of California diploma who taught successfully for two years and had the faculty recommendation could obtain a permanent life-time certificate by showing that he had completed, ". . . the prescribed course in the Pedagogical Department of the State University."³⁸

The law also recognized that secondary education was different from elementary education, and that there should be corresponding differences in the preparation and certification of high school teachers. This special preparation

³⁷California Statutes, Thirtieth Session, 1893,
Chapter CXCI, sec. 48, p. 260.

³⁸Ibid.

and education was provided for in the requirement calling for high school certification.³⁹

Summary

Under the first constitution of the State a strongly centralized government was established. The early Legislatures created a State Board of Education as well as county boards, and local boards of education. Authorization to hold teachers' examinations and to issue teaching certificates based on these examinations was made. Since setting up schools and hiring the teachers was largely a matter of local concern the control of examination and certification during the early years of statehood was done by local boards.

These boards were composed of laymen; dissatisfaction grew over the low standards that prevailed when such boards had the power to examine teachers and to issue certificates.

In 1860 a State Board of Examination was established, and in 1863 it was specified that certification for teaching in high school would be granted by the State Board of Education.

This State control of examination and certification led to higher standards and uniformity since the certificates so issued were valid throughout the State. Widespread

³⁹ Ibid.

scandals in the Administration of the State examinations, however, led to their repudiation in 1879 when the new Constitution, de-emphasizing strong State government, was adopted.

Local control of examination and certification led to low standards and low esteem for the teachers so certificated. Scandal was prevalent and cramming schools flourished.

The solution to these problems was seen to be the use of credentials rather than examination as the basis for certification. Legislation along these lines was enacted in 1891 and 1893. County boards under the law of 1891 were authorized to issue high school certificates on the basis of credentials. In 1893 the State Board was empowered to specify the credentials upon which the county boards were to grant certificates. Under this provision the State Board specified that the credential was to include both academic and professional education.

The policy of differentiation between high school and elementary preparation and certification was also established by the law of 1893.

By the early 1890's many of the elements necessary for the future adoption of the fifth-year requirement were beginning to be recognized. Among those noted were stronger central control of certification, the use of credentials based on diplomas, academic preparation and professional

education as a basis for certification, the value of faculty recommendation, and the need for different education of high school teachers.

These were significant steps on the road toward professionally prepared teachers; however, it should be noted that the door to certification was still wide open to those who chose to enter via the examination of a county or city board. The certification law of 1893, clearly marked a turning away from the policy of the 1879 Constitutional revision, toward the centralization of control and the establishment of more uniform and professional standards of certification based upon credentials rather than examination.

CHAPTER IV

DEVELOPMENTS LEADING UP TO THE FIFTH-YEAR REQUIREMENT

As was shown in the previous chapters there was a definite movement in California as evidenced by the certification law of 1893, away from the control of examination and certification by lay boards of education. Professional control of these functions was being increasingly assumed by examination boards of teachers and by the State Board of Education which was composed of professional educators. This chapter will relate, in a chronological manner, the progressive chain of developing thought and action that led to the adoption of the fifth-year requirement for high school certification.

I. EDUCATORS RECOGNIZE NEED FOR CERTIFICATION REFORM

The previously mentioned Committee of Ten of the National Education Association, which had been appointed to make recommendations concerning high school curricula throughout the nation, made the following statement concerning preparation in its report of 1894:

Persons who read all the appended reports will observe the frequent occurrence of the statement that, in order to introduce the changes recommended, teachers more highly

trained will be needed in both the elementary and the secondary schools.¹

The teachers of the State, who were themselves the closest to the problem of certification, were early in advocating changes in the qualifications necessary for credentialing.

The Stockton schools were highly regarded state-wide and nation-wide for their excellence and their use of new ideas. In 1895 a Stockton teachers committee adopted a resolution supporting the need to select teachers on the basis of their qualifications and not on social or political influence.²

They recommended that teachers have the following qualifications:

1. General education equivalent to that afforded by a good high-school.
2. A course in professional training in a State normal school or university, or in equivalent, at least two years of successful experience in teaching.
3. Reasonable amount of current professional study.
4. High moral character and kindly ability with children.

¹ National Education Association, The Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies (New York: The American Book Company, 1894), p. 17.

² Stockton Teachers Committee, "Resolution," Western Journal of Education, I (August 1, 1895), p. 14.

5. A capacity for and a desire to improve professionally.³

Other professional educators were recognizing also the need for changes toward more centralized state control of certification. By 1896 the County and City Superintendents, in their biennial convention, had a heated battle on this issue and finally endorsed the credential system as the basis for high-school certification only.⁴

In their meeting they took the following action:

Resolved the appointment of a committee of seven, and the Superintendent of Public Instruction, to present a revision of the law in reference to the Certification of teachers, to the Code Commission.⁵

State Superintendent Black advocated an amendment to the Constitution, taking from the County Boards of Education the power of issuing certificates except as authorized by the legislature. The Convention voted it down, but did approve it concerning high-school certificates.

This action created more feeling than any other event in the convention and Superintendent Black announced that he would not abide by the will of the majority. The convention for a while did not know where it was at.⁶

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵County and City Superintendents, "Resolutions of the Biennial Convention, 1896," Western Journal of Education, II (August, 1896), p. 2.

⁶Ibid.

Local superintendents had thus taken a step toward advocacy of an important stepping stone necessary to achieve the fifth-year requirement, i.e., state control of secondary certification.

Other educators were also expressing their awareness of the need for more thoroughly educated teachers. Samuel T. Black, California Superintendent of Public Instruction, in an address to the teachers of Santa Clara County in 1897 said:

Education is today evolving. At the present time teachers should be required to present certificates showing their qualifications for their positions. In my opinion the time has come in the evolution of education where there should be a special preparation for those expecting to teach.⁷

Superintendent Black reflects the developing awareness of the need to base certification upon the individual's credentials as well as the need for special preparation for teachers.

The value of a university education was also recognized as an important qualification for teaching. The previously discussed certification law of 1893 made provision for the issuance of a permanent certificate of qualification to graduates of the University of California who had subse-

⁷Samuel T. Black, "The Certification of Teachers," Western Journal of Education, II (December, 1897), p. 49.

quently taught successfully for a period of two years.⁸

This law of 1893 was significant in many ways in the history of California certification. For purposes of this study it was important for it recognized that there were differences between secondary and elementary education and it provided for these differences in its stipulations. The National Education Association also recognized that there were differences between elementary and secondary education and that college preparation was needed for high school teachers. The previously mentioned Committee of Fifteen of the National Education Association, studying educational problems, made recommendations on the education of teachers in its report of 1895. Among these recommendations the committee stated that "teachers of high schools should have a collegiate education." This recommendation was in keeping with the provisions of the California certification law of 1893.⁹

II. THE CALIFORNIA TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION PROVIDES LEADERSHIP

The Stockton teachers were joined by their colleagues

⁸California Statutes, Thirtieth Session, 1893,
Chapter CXCI, sec. 48, p. 260.

⁹National Education Association, The Report of the
Committee of Fifteen (New York: The American Book Company,
1895), p. 19.

throughout the state in manifesting a professional attitude which advocated better educational preparation of teachers. The California Teachers Association was instrumental in channeling this desire.

In 1895 a California State Teachers' Association committee on High School Certificates was appointed to conduct a study and make recommendations for action. At the California Teachers Association meeting in Oakland in January 1896, the Committee headed by Fernando Sanford made its recommendations:

Your committee, while recognizing that the present system of examination had led to an unusually high standard of scholarship on the part of the high school teachers of California, still believes that a more nearly uniform system of issuing certificates throughout the State would greatly increase the efficiency of many of our high schools. To secure such uniformity it seems necessary that the qualification of applicants should be determined by some examining board appointed for the whole State.¹⁰

This board, the report continued, should be composed of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Professor of Education at the University of California, and three high school principals.

It is further recommended by the Council that in the future only those teachers who have had a

¹⁰Fernando Sanford, "Report of the Committee on High School Certificates," Proceedings of the California Teachers Association Convention 1896 (San Francisco: The Association), p. 42.

liberal training equivalent to that given by the best colleges and universities of the country shall be eligible to the position of high school teachers in California. It is not insisted, however, that the whole of such preparation shall have been acquired in college, providing the applicant shall be able to show by examination that he has reached the proficiency in any general line of study required for the baccalaureate degree in our best colleges.¹¹

The committee cited that there was a surplus of high school teachers in the state and that the supply of new teachers could be obtained within the scope of increased requirements.

Concerning subject matter preparation the committee stated:

It is believed that the best high school instruction can be given only by teachers, who, in addition to a general training, are especially qualified in some particular department of knowledge. It would accordingly seem desirable that such examinations as are given should be based principally upon the specialty which the applicant expects to teach, and that the certificate should indicate the subjects in which the teacher is approved by the examining board.¹²

An expression of the desirability of including professional education as a requirement for certification was also made.

The question as to whether a high school teacher shall be required to have pursued a course of so-called professional study in the educational department of some college or normal school was not passed upon by the Council. In the opinion

¹¹Ibid.

¹²Ibid., p. 43.

of the committee, such a course is highly desirable, and should, if not absolutely required, be strongly recommended.

Fernando Sanford
Frank Morton
Elmer E. Brown¹³

In this succinct committee report are to be found recommendations for increases in teacher education which may be summarized as follows:

- (1) general education is necessary to a well rounded teacher;
- (2) a teacher must be qualified in a subject matter area of knowledge;
- (3) professional study in an education department is highly important;
- (4) graduation from an approved college or its equivalent should be a basic requirement for a high school teacher.

The Weaknesses of the Examination System Exposed

A further indication of the current of educational thought which was pressing for higher standards of preparation is found in an address to the San Francisco meeting of the California Teachers Association in December 1897 by Samuel T. Black.

He pointed out that a glaring weakness in the obsolete examination system of certification was that it stressed a

¹³Ibid.

candidate's academic preparation to the almost complete exclusion of his professional education. Superintendent Black said:

I favor the preparation of teachers at public expense, but as little of this preparation as possible should be done at the expense of the children. It should be done in the future, as far as practicable, prior to taking up the actual work and responsibility of the teacher.¹⁴

Black goes on to indicate that the policy of issuing high school credentials on the basis of county board examinations had created the untenable position of having fifty-seven separate standards, one for each county in the state.¹⁵

Superintendent Black also indicated that there was a surplus of high school teachers in the state but that without higher standards of preparation the best ones would not necessarily be doing the teaching.

It has been estimated that there are between eight hundred and one thousand teachers in this State who cannot get positions. Every one of us is aware of the keen competition resulting from this surplus of teachers. If the result of this severe competition were to secure the best teachers for our schools, it would not be so disastrous. It is, however, otherwise, and the tendency is to give the position to those

¹⁴Samuel T. Black, "The Certification of Teachers," Proceedings of the California Teachers Association Convention, 1897 (San Francisco: The Association), p. 67.

¹⁵Ibid.

teachers who will accept them for the least salary.¹⁶

This address pointed out the need for changes in many ways and strengthened the recommendations of the Sanford Committee. It also stressed the need for the inclusion of professional education work in the college preparation of high school teachers.

Professional Teacher Education Requested by the State's Educators

Other educators throughout the state were also pointing out the need for better teachers. Elmer E. Brown, Professor of Education at the University of California, addressed a group of teachers in this manner in October 1897:

The tendency of the time is toward the requirements of a full course of professional training on the part of teachers. Our hope that our graduates may find employment in the schools must rest on our hope that they may prove to be exceptionally well prepared and competent.¹⁷

Professor Brown continued that he felt that the State Board of Education should require that teachers should be professionally prepared.¹⁸

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 72.

¹⁷ Elmer E. Brown, "The Selection of Teachers," Western Journal of Education, II (November, 1897), p. 10.

¹⁸ Ibid.

This advocacy of more leadership on the part of the State Board of Education was a factor in securing the fifth-year program, for its later adoption was by this board.

At the same convention, Alfred Harrell, President of the San Joaquin Teachers' Association, spoke out on the need for the elimination of county control of credentialing.¹⁹

He also went on to say:

The necessity in the school work for trained teachers is growing with the growth of the school interests and of such importance is the demand to merit the attention of the State's law-givers at an early day.²⁰

It should also be pointed out again at this time, as it was in Chapter II of this study, that by 1898 the curriculum of the high schools was broadening. A much wider variety of subjects was presented since it became recognized that the role of the high school went beyond solely preparing students for future college enrollment.²¹

F.H. Clark of the Lowell High School, San Francisco, said:

¹⁹Alfred Harrell, "President's address," San Joaquin Valley Teachers' Association Convention, October 1897," Western Journal of Education, II (November, 1897), p. 16.

²⁰Ibid., p. 17.

²¹Frederick Ferley Johnson, "The Organization of Instruction in High Schools," California Teachers' Association Proceedings of the Third Annual Session of the Northern Section, December 1898 (San Francisco: The Association, 1899), p. 60.

It is the province of the secondary school to afford the widest possible training for all to become useful and worthy citizens of a free state, at the same time preparing and selecting candidates for the university.²²

Dr. Scott, Principal of Alameda High School, is said by Johnson to have stated that:

Some pupils come to his school with almost no capacity for mathematics, but with bright literary powers; others with no aptitude for foreign languages, but ready grasp of mathematics. Instead of forcing such pupils in studies in which they can gain neither interest nor proficiency, he would allow election. The Oakland High School allows its pupils to choose any one of eleven courses, of which five are preparatory to the university.²³

Thus with the high school curriculum expanding the teachers needed to be prepared more broadly to teach a wider variety of subjects. This too had its bearing upon the need for a fifth-year of preparation for high school teachers.

III. SOLUTIONS HINGE ON STATE AND COLLEGE CONTROL

The California Teachers' Association Recommends a State Controlled Credential System of Certification

In 1899 the California Teachers' Association again demonstrated its leadership in the drive for better teacher preparation. Its Committee on Certification of Teachers made the following report to the convention:

²² Ibid., p. 61.

²³ Ibid., p. 62.

The State Board of Education shall name the credentials upon which teachers may be certified to teach in the high schools of this State. The credentials must be, in the judgement of said Board the equivalent of the credentials issued by the Faculty of the University of California to graduates who are recommended by said Faculty for teachers' certificates. And it is hereby made the duty of the Faculty of the University of California to adopt a standard of qualification and to maintain the same for the graduates of said University who are recommended for teachers' certificates, provided that no graduate shall be recommended for a teachers certificate who has not taken the prescribed University course in pedagogy.²⁴

In this concise recommendation, made in 1899, are embodied principles, some of which have been achieved in this state and some for which the profession is still striving.

The salient features of this proposal were:

1. The State Board of Education shall be charged with the responsibility of naming the credentials necessary for the high school certificate.
2. These credentials must be, in the Board's opinion, equivalent to those of the University of California.
3. Graduation from the University is not enough; the candidate must also be recommended by the faculty of the University.

²⁴Robert Furlong, "Report of the Committee on Certification of Teachers," Proceedings of the California Teachers' Association Convention, 1899 (San Francisco: The Association), p. 139.

4. The University of California shall set the standards necessary for their recommendation for a teachers' certificate.

5. Graduates shall take the University's prescribed education courses in order to be recommended. This meant additional college preparation for teacher candidates.

The ability of the faculty to withhold its recommendation, of graduates as shown in 3 above, meant it could require additional preparation for teacher candidates.²⁵

Samuel T. Black, who in 1899 was President of the San Diego State Normal School, also decried the need for more college control of teacher selection. He noted even though County Boards of Education still possessed the power to grant certificates and determine the worth of credentials they should be diligent in their exercise of this power.

The fact that the State Board has recommended a certain educational institution as being of the same rank as the State University of California does not empower a local board to issue a high school or other certificate to the graduate of such institution. This act of the State Board simply paves the way for such graduate to prove that he is worthy to receive such certificate. Only when the applicant has complied with the remaining provision of the section is the local board empowered to act. His diploma of graduation must be accompanied by a recommendatory certificate from the faculty of his alma mater, showing that he

²⁵Lucien B. Kinney, "The Development of the Five-Year Program of Teacher Education in California," Educational Outlook, 16 (March, 1942), p. 98.

has had academic and professional training equivalent to that required by the University of California. This certificate is in my judgement, the more important credential of the two. A county board might be excused for not requiring the actual presentation of the diploma, but to grant a license to teach without the recommendatory certificate of the faculty is unpardonable.²⁶

President Black went on to emphasize the importance of the State's institutions of higher education in the professional preparation of teachers.

The necessity of special training and preparation for the occupation (or profession, if you please) of teaching has so forced itself on public opinion that four new State normal schools have been created since 1880, and the State University has added a pedagogical department. It was Stanford, I believe, that inaugurated the movement on this Coast. Berkeley was quick to learn the lesson; and to-day all the smaller colleges and universities on the Pacific slope have followed in the footsteps of the great universities. Do we not see in these movements the handwriting on the wall? Is not the granting of certificates by means of written examinations soon to take third or fourth rank, instead of the first, among the many important duties of the County Board? Nay, is not the day near at hand-- is it not already upon us-- when the cramming route to a teacher's certificate should be forever closed? Let me quote from a private communication written by one of the best known and most conservative County Superintendents in this State: 'For the past two years I have been of the opinion that the time has come when we can safely depart from the old method of qualifying teachers by the examination process as provided by statute. While our present system has served a good purpose in the past, California has, in my judgement, outgrown the primitive conditions

²⁶ Samuel T. Black, "The County Board - Its Duties and Opportunities," Proceedings of the California Teachers Association Convention, 1899 (San Francisco: The Association), p. 40.

for which the system was established. To me the conditions now appear to be such that our State can safely say, through its Legislature, that only such teachers as have been especially trained for their work may teach in the public schools of this State.' The conclusion arrived at by my correspondent is one that will meet with the hearty concurrence of all unselfish school officers and teachers. He fully recognized that the examination method of qualifying teachers, notwithstanding its past usefulness, has outgrown itself, and that the time is fully ripe for a radical departure. It is time that the important business of teaching should dignify itself-- that it should cease to be an occupation and become a profession in the true sense of the term. It is time that the intelligence of the State should join the law-making body and, in the name of the children petition for such legislation as will best conserve their educational rights. The children are the educational wards of teachers, superintendents and other school officers. A State cannot impose a greater trust than this. Let us, then, not shrink from the sacred duty thus imposed upon us.²⁷

Black also voiced his views on the desirable over-all qualifications for teachers:

The granting of teachers' certificates in examination by County and City Boards of Education should be discontinued. The adoption of this recommendation would soon come to mean professionally trained teachers in our schools, and consequently, better teaching. It would also mean a saving of \$40,000 to \$50,000 annually to the tax-payers of the State. . . . The minimum scholastic qualifications for . . . the high school certificate, (should be) the full equivalent of a good college or university course. To these scholastic requirements there should, in each instance, be added suitable professional preparation or study.²⁸

²⁷Ibid., p. 41-42.

²⁸Samuel T. Black, "Recommendations to the Legislature," Western Journal of Education, IV (February, 1899), p. 20.

The voice of other normal schools was also raised on behalf of the need for change. Frederick Burk, President of the San Francisco Normal School, had this to say at the 1899 California Teachers' Association Convention:

The latter quarter of this century has been what our evolutionary brethren would term a period of rapid transition. We feel under our feet a shifting of educational foundations. The forces of . . . social readjustment . . . are shaking our educational bases and many are they who believe that the new century will usher in a new educational dispensation.²⁹

By 1899 the surplus of teachers that Superintendent Burk had referred to two years earlier was even more pronounced. Again a state normal school president, Charles H. Allen, expressed the need for better teacher preparation as a means of ensuring that the best teachers would be employed. He stated:

A yearly supply of two thousand (teachers) with a consumption of eight hundred means a rapidly increasing surplus, the very state of things that is found to exist. Is a remedy needed, and if so, what is it, and how shall it be applied? Is it better to restrict the work of the normal schools, or of the county examinations?

Most educators are of the opinion that only specially trained teachers should be employed. This carried out would mean no more county examinations. It is to be feared that this would create great dissatisfaction. It is urged, and

²⁹Frederick Burk, "California's Present Duty to Her Educational Future," Proceedings of the California Teachers Association Convention, 1899 (San Francisco: The Association), p. 25.

with truth too, that many excellent teachers have come into the ranks thru (sic) the door of the examination, and without special training.

No one, however, will question that even these would have been better teachers, with special preparation for their work. The interests of our public schools are so great that we should give them the best teachers possible.

The State is paying large sums of money to support its normal schools and the pedagogical department in the State University, and private munificence is doing the same at the other great University (Stanford). If the people of the State are wise they will get all the benefit they can from these expenditures. To give preference to "home-made" teachers is to deprive the children of the State of that which is their right. They are entitled to the best, and the people cannot afford to give them less.³⁰

Again we see expressed the need for more education for teachers which would lead to the fifth-year requirement.

IV. CALIFORNIA STATE EDUCATIONAL COMMISSION

The ferment in California educational circles caused by an inadequately educated teaching force was evident. The need to improve teacher education and thus to improve the quality of teaching in the state's schools was strongly voiced.³¹

This need led to the formation of a state educational commission, which in the words of Roy W. Cloud, made many

³⁰Charles H. Allen, "The Supply of Teachers," Western Journal of Education, IV (September, 1899), p. 8.

³¹Roy W. Cloud, Education in California (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1952), p. 108.

"far reaching" recommendations.³²

The California Teachers' Association, with its membership embracing all facets of education in the state, again supplied the leadership and the organizational structure from which this commission could emanate.

Frederick Burk, as president of the California Teachers' Association, addressed the 1899 Convention, held in Sacramento, in terms of "California's Present Duty to Her Educational Future." In his address he said:

We need a commission which shall be representative of the best educational views; which shall also contain a representation of lay educators of the State of such standing and dignity in the community as will command the respect and attention of the Legislature. The limitation of the action of this body however is a matter which may wisely be left to its deliberation. To this end, in conclusion, I recommend that this association request the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the President of the State University and the President of Stanford University to appoint a commission, of which they shall be members and of such size as they may determine; and that this commission shall consider by whatever plan it may deem wise, the reorganization of the school laws to meet modern conditions and to prepare the way for future progress.³³

A committee, chaired by C.C. Van Liew, President of the Chico State Normal School, was appointed to act upon Burk's proposal. They reported to the convention:

³²Ibid., p. 102.

³³Burk, op. cit., p. 36.

We, your committee, appointed by this Association to report upon the recommendation of President Burk, relative to the appointment of a Commission upon school Legislation, do hereby report endorsing the plan recommended by him, viz.: That a commission be appointed, to consist of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, the President of the Univ. of Calif., the President of the Leland Stanford Jr. Univ. and of such other representative educators of this State as they may decide to associate with them, the size and personnel of the commission being left to the three above named; and that this commission shall consider, by whatever plan it may deem wise, the reorganization of the school laws of Calif., or such changes in the present laws as may seem wise, and be prepared to recommend to the next legislature, either a definite budget of school legislation or at least secure the appointment, by the authority of the legislature, of such a commission, to report at the following session.

In the judgment of this Committee the plan as just outlined seems to be a most desirable one, as it gives the teachers of the State a chance to express themselves in a united manner and through a commission of experts in whom all the educational interests of the State will have confidence.

Respectfully submitted,

C.C. Van Liew, Chairman
 Ellwood P. Cubberley
 Jas. A. Barr
 H.M. Bland
 W.H.V. Raymond³⁴

The Association accepted these recommendations and

"The California State Educational Commission" was created.³⁵

The Commission of seventy-five members was selected by

³⁴C.C. Van Liew, "Report of Committee on the President's Address," Proceedings of the California Teachers Association Convention of 1899 (San Francisco: The Association), pp. 141-142.

³⁵Cloud, op. cit., p. 108.

Superintendent of Public Instruction Thos. J. Kirk; President Benjamin Ide Wheeler of the University of California; and President David Starr Jordan of Stanford University. They met in the rooms of the Board of Education in San Francisco, April 12, 1900.

The meeting was called to order by Superintendent of Public Instruction Thos. J. Kirk. H. Weinstock of Sacramento, was elected president; Professor Elmer E. Brown was chosen vice-president; G.W. Beattie of Berkeley was made Secretary. The roll call showed 45 members present. [See Appendix A for a listing of these members.]

A sub-committee of eight members, Superintendent Thos. J. Kirk (Chairman), Elmer E. Brown, Ellwood F. Cubberley, J.W. McClymonds, J.W. Linscott, Robert Furlong, R.M. Shackelford, and G.W. Beattie had been appointed to outline work for the Commission, and a synopsis of their recommendations had been mailed to each member.³⁶

This sub-committee of educators submitted this synopsis of their recommendations:

I. Certification of Teachers.

1. No changes should be made that impair the validity of existing certificates, and such certificates should be renewable as heretofore.
2. Statistics show that the formal examination as a basis for certification is becoming obsolete, and that the credential basis is rapidly increasing in favor. Also, that our professional training schools are supplying as many teachers as the schools require.

³⁶ California State Education Commission, "Report of the Meeting of April 12, 1900," Western Journal of Education, V (May, 1900), p. 18.

3. The large excess of certificated teachers in the State makes it practicable to raise the requirements for teachers' certificates.
- 4a. High-school certificates should be issued on credentials only; . . .³⁷

State Commission Recommends Credential System for High School Certification in 1900

After organizing, the Commission proceeded to consider the recommendations of the sub-committee.

On behalf of the sub-committee Superintendent Robert Furlong (County Superintendent, San Rafael) presented a plan for certificating teachers, which, after amendment by the Commission, was adopted as the intent of the meeting:

The State Board of Education shall name the credentials upon which persons may be certified to teach in the high schools of this State. The credentials must be, in the judgment of said Board, the equivalent of a diploma of graduation from the University of California, with a recommendation from the faculty thereof, for a teachers' certificate of high school grade. No graduate from said University shall be thus recommended who has not taken the minimum amount of pedagogy prescribed by the State Board of Education. Said Board may also consider the cases of individual applicants, and in doing so may take cognizance of any adequate evidence of preparation equivalent to that of recommended university graduates which the applicants may present.

County Boards of Education shall be authorized to issue teachers' certificates. . . . High School certificates may be issued only upon the credentials

³⁷ California State Educational Commission, "Sub-Committee Report of April 12, 1900," Western Journal of Education, V (April, 1900), p. 39.

named by the State Board of Education, as provided in Section 2. . . .³⁸

The recommendations submitted by Furlong were accompanied by an explanatory paper. This was supplemented by a paper from G.W. Beattie, giving recently collected data concerning the supply of teachers in the state, and the demand for them; a statement of the outlook in California concerning certification of teachers, and a discussion of the future of county boards of education.

Beattie's information (see Appendix B) supplied data showing that there were 1186 current holders of high school certificates in the State and only 495 total high school positions in the State. He pointed out that the State's universities and normal schools would supply more high school teachers than the high schools demanded.³⁹ The ample supply meant that the examination method for certification was not necessary. It also meant that the method of certificating high school teachers should be upgraded in order to provide a more adequately prepared high school teaching force.

The County and City Superintendents at their biennial convention in 1900 appointed a committee to study the proposals of the State Educational Commission concerning teacher

³⁸Ibid., pp. 19-20.

³⁹G.W. Beattie, "Certification of Teachers, The Duties of County Boards of Education," Western Journal of Education, V (May, 1900), p. 21-24.

certification.

The committee submitted the following report:

We have carefully considered in detail the suggested plans for certification as adopted by the State Educational Commission, together with the classification of schools and the duties of state and county boards of education in relation to certification. We have also considered the plans for certification submitted to this board by Superintendent Doub of Kern County and Superintendent Webster of San Francisco, and have listened to addresses and suggestions from other members of this convention in relation to the subject before us. Your committee recommends as follows: The committee's recommendation was nearly word for word the same as the Commission's, due no doubt largely to the fact that Superintendent Robert Furlong of San Rafael was on both committees.⁴⁰

This position of the county and city superintendents showed them to be more fully in sympathy with the idea of state control of certification than they were in their stormy 1896 convention.⁴¹

This advocacy for well educated teachers also received support from sources outside of California.

J.E. Russell, Dean of the Teachers' College, Columbia University wrote:

We as teachers have many faults. We haven't sufficient command of the instruments used in our

⁴⁰County and City Superintendents, "Proceedings of Biennial Convention, 1900," Western Journal of Education (September, 1900), p. 33.

⁴¹County and City Superintendents, "Resolutions of the Biennial Convention, 1896," Western Journal of Education, II (August, 1896), p. 2.

schools: we don't know enough of the subjects we are teaching. We take up the work the day after we quit being scholars.

There is no curse in the American public school system as great as this lack of preparation on the part of teachers. If we are to make a step forward we must have a more thoro /sic/ going and a more finished scholarship than ever before. We as teachers must take hold of this question and put our profession where it belongs. We must fight against incompetent teaching as malpractice is fought against in surgery. Teachers of the future must be more fitted for the work professionally and scholastically.⁴²

V. NEW LAW -- NEW PROGRESS

Certification Law of 1901 Establishes the Credential System of Certification

In 1901 the California State legislature showed their faith in the Educational Commission's proposals by enacting the most important of the recommendations into a new certification law.

The key section of that law as it concerns this study were:

Section 2. Section fifteen hundred and twenty-one of the Political Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

1521. The powers and duties of the state board of education are as follows: (2) (a) To prescribe by general rule the credentials upon which persons may be granted certificates to teach in the high schools of this state. No credentials shall be prescribed or allowed, unless the same, in the

⁴²J.E. Russell, "Teachers are Under Educated," Western Journal of Education, VI (September, 1901), p. 18.

judgment of said board, are the equivalent of a diploma of graduation from the University of California, and are satisfactory evidence that the holder thereof has taken an amount of pedagogy equivalent to the minimum amount of pedagogy prescribed by the state board of education of this state, and includes a recommendation for a high school certificate from the faculty of the institution in which the pedagogical work shall have been taken.⁴³

Section 4. Section seventeen hundred and seventy of said code is hereby amended to read as follows:

1775. (1) County boards of education may, without examination, grant certificates as follows:

(a) High school certificates: (1) To the holders of credentials approved by the state board of education in accordance with subdivision two of section fifteen hundred and twenty-one of this code; (2) to the holders of special credentials issued by said state board, in accordance with said subdivision; (3) to holders of high school certificates issued by any county, or city and county, board of education in this state; (4) to holders of normal school diplomas accompanied by documents from the faculty of the state university, . . .⁴⁴

The new features of this act which became effective on July 1, 1901 were:

1. It abolished county and city board examinations for high school certificates.

2. It provided that all high school certificates would be granted on credentials prescribed by the state board of education. Special individual cases could also be considered by the board.

⁴³California Statutes, Thirty-fourth Session, 1901, Chapter XXIX, sec. 2, p. 668.

⁴⁴Ibid., sec. 4, p. 670.

3. It provided that all high school credentials must be equivalent to a University of California diploma.

4. It required that the professional training must be equal to that prescribed by the State Board of Education.

5. It required an applicant to have the recommendation for a high school credential from the faculty at the institution where his professional education work was taken.

6. It established statewide uniformity in high school certification.

This law was a step forward in improving standards. It emphasized the desirability of a formal academic and professional education rather than preparation gained informally and by experience. It also marked a decided movement toward centralized state control of certification.

The law however still delegated the task of evaluating the credentials to the county or city boards. The state did not centrally evaluate them even though the State Board of Education did prescribe the credential requirements.

State Board of Education Adopts Practice Teaching Requirement in 1902

Acting within the scope of the new Credential law, the State Board of Education on January 18, 1902, adopted rules and regulations for its own guidance in the granting of credentials for high school certificates, and for the guidance

of county, and city and county boards of education in granting high school certificates:

On and after the first day of July, 1901, and until further notice, County, or City and County Boards of Educ. are authorized to grant high School Certificates (according to law as provided in Sections 1521 (2) (a), and 1775 (1) (a) of the Political Code of California), to graduates of the following universities: [they then listed seventeen universities including/ "University of California and Stanford."

Graduates of the above mentioned colleges may be granted certificates upon presentation of a recommendation from the faculty of any one of these institutions; provided, that such recommendation shall show that the applicant has taken courses in the theory of education, or in the actual practice of teaching, under supervision of the pedagogical faculty, equivalent to twelve hours per week for one half year: provided, that, after July, 1906, at least one third of the prescribed pedagogy shall consist of actual teaching in a well-equipped training school of secondary grade, directed by the department of education.⁴⁵

These regulations left no doubt that the State Board of Education was responsible for high school certification.

In terms of this study, the provision requiring practice teaching, under the supervision of the educational faculty at the recommending institution, meant that teacher education and certification had taken a tremendous stride forward with the credential law of 1901.

The California Teachers' Association once again pointed the way by devoting much of its 1901-02 Convention to the

⁴⁵California, Twentieth Biennial Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1901-1902, p. 27.

topic, "The Preparation of the State's Teachers."

W.C. Doub, Superintendent of Schools in Kern County, summed up the situation in his remarks to the convention.

The present law regulating the granting of certificates . . . has placed an additional responsibility on the state normal schools and on the educational departments of the University.⁴⁶

The education which teachers received in these schools was "not what it should be," and Superintendent Doub proposed to point out the shortcomings which his observation had revealed.

The three main defects that Doub found in the normal schools were:

1. low admission standards
2. lack of practical work in actual teaching
3. a failure to dismiss those who evidenced an unfitness to teach.⁴⁷

The University's shortcomings were the same as (2), above, and (3) in that they were unable, in the absence of a practice teaching program, to refuse credentials to those who would not make good teachers. No one, he felt, should be granted credentials to teach who had not proven his ability

⁴⁶W.C. Doub, "The Preparation of Teachers by the State," Proceedings of the California Teachers Association 1901-1902, Western Journal of Education, VII (March, 1902), p. 181.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 182.

by actual teaching under natural conditions. Nor should the State Board of Education accredit any University that did not meet this standard.⁴⁸

"The people," he concluded, "have given to the universities almost the entire responsibility of preparing teachers for the secondary schools, and this confidence should not be violated."⁴⁹

C.C. Van Liew, President of the Chico State Normal School and a member of the State Board of Education, addressed the same convention to urge better teacher selection. He voiced the need for more formal education for teachers. There were still, however, inadequacies in the laws that permitted "weak and unimpressive personalities" to compete with competent teachers for positions.⁵⁰ This competition, if continued, would perpetuate low standards of living, of teaching and of professional ethics. The competition from those who should never have entered the field was making it "daily harder to get high school positions at living wages."⁵¹

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 182-83.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 184.

⁵⁰C.C. Van Liew, "The Present Duty of the State Touching the Training of its Elementary and Secondary Teachers," Proceedings of the California Teachers Association, 1901-1902, Western Journal of Education, VII (March, 1902), p. 157.

⁵¹Ibid.

The problem, continued Van Liew, was further complicated because neither the University of California nor Stanford University had, as Superintendent Doub previously pointed out, a training school.

Direct training facilities of some kind, either in a special school supported by university funds or in such local high schools as the community may see fit to place under control of the university's educational department [are needed].⁵²

These schools would offer a legitimate means of curbing unequal competition, and substituting healthy competition between equally well prepared teachers. The answer to these problems would be higher standards for the profession which would eliminate the incompetents and provide a better and more respected teaching force which would be decently supported.

The Content of a Sound Teacher Education Program was Outlined in 1902

The type of education which President Van Liew proposed was outlined as follows:

1. a broad general education
2. specialization in a subject area
3. professional and technical knowledge
 - a. history of education
 - b. educational psychology

⁵²Ibid., p. 165.

- c. theory and art of teaching including curriculum and methods
 - d. practice teaching
4. experience in the field prior to granting a permanent certificate.⁵³

F.B. Dresslar, Professor of Education at the University of California, also spoke to the convention, expressing his views on teacher education. His ideas were in agreement with those of Van Liew. He advocated general education; professional education including history, human development, and methodology; and he strongly advocated practice teaching.

No theoretical preparation can take the place of practice work. It is here, in the application that the theoretical work can be made most intelligible and effective, and it is here also that habits of careful preparation and critical presentation can be most readily formed and firmly fixed. Under careful and sympathetic supervision a practice school will not weaken or destroy the personality of a teacher, but strengthen it and make it most effective.⁵⁴

Some teaching candidates may pass all the examinations and may meet all the theoretical requirements but do not make good teachers. "There is no way to find them out and turn them aside save thru [sic] the opportunity afforded by a practice school," he asserted.⁵⁵

⁵³Ibid., pp. 158-163.

⁵⁴F.B. Dresslar, "The Present Duty of the State Touching the Training of its Elementary and Secondary Teachers," Proceedings of the California Teachers Association, 1901-1902, Western Journal of Education, VII (March, 1902), p. 169.

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 167.

Dr. Dresslar went a step further than others had previously gone, and in so doing he definitely gave voice to the need for graduate level education.

After having had a broad and thorough general education background, those who are preparing to be high school teachers should be specialists, Dresslar contended.

He who has a full and critical knowledge of what he offers to teach, thereby commends it as a subject worthy of careful and continued study. Further than this such scholarship predisposes the youth to believe in the teacher, and to go to him for advice and help, thus establishing between them that spiritual confidence which is an essential condition for the most effective instruction. This natural worship of learning renders the scholarly teacher, who at the same time is morally worthy, the most efficient civilizer in his community. . . .⁵⁶

For purposes of this study, it is noteworthy where Dresslar proposes this specialization should take place.

This specialization should be done in the main as graduate work, otherwise it will so encroach on the undergraduate course as to enfeeble it.⁵⁷

This recommendation for graduate preparation of high school teachers, when added to the other suggestions made for improved teacher education, and when viewed in the light of conditions existent in the state, definitely set the stage for the addition of the fifth-year requirement.

⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 169.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

Summary

By the mid 1890's it was evident that the examination system of certification was not providing a sound secondary teaching force. By the late 1890's its glaring weaknesses became even more pronounced as the supply of ill-prepared teachers that it bred increased far beyond the number of available high school teaching positions. Under this system there were different standards for each county which led to much confusion. An even more devastating fault, however, was that the examination system stressed academic preparation to the almost complete exclusion of professional preparation.

The California Teachers' Association provided the leadership necessary to effect changes in the certification system through the study and recommendations of its committees and through the support and influence of its membership.

The Sanford Committee of the California Teachers Association, as early as 1896, advocated an education program for high school teachers which would include: a broad general education evidenced by a college degree, competence in subject matter and some professional education.

By 1899 this recommendation of the California Teachers Association had been expanded to suggest improvements in the certification system itself. This recommendation called for high school certification based on credentials approved by the State Board of Education as being equal to graduation

from the University of California with a faculty recommendation for teaching. They also recommended freedom for the University to set up its own program for teacher education. Thus the California Teachers Association was advocating state control of certification based on credentials received at the recommending college from which the candidate was graduated.

The California Teachers Association broadened its base of influence by establishing in 1899 a combined professional and lay group named the California Educational Commission. Due in large measure to the influence of this commission, that made recommendations in 1900, the certification law of 1901 was passed. This law, which was based on the California Teachers Association's recommendations, established the credential system of certification in California.

The salient features of this law concerning high school certification were: abolishment of examinations; certification based on credentials which must be equivalent to a University of California diploma; a college faculty recommendation to teach; professional education; and a uniform system throughout the State.

This law meant that California had centralized the control of certification and the certification was based on credentials requiring formal education.

The State Board of Education acting under its authority prescribed by this law added the requirements of practice

teaching to the requirements for high school certification in 1902, to be effective in 1906.

Educators throughout the State pointed out that the responsibility for teacher selection and education was clearly in the hands of the universities. These institutions, however, were falling short in meeting this responsibility because they had no adequate practice teaching programs and thus had no sound method of selecting those candidates who would make the best teachers.

In the light of these deficiencies, and in keeping with the general overall progress being made, the California Teachers Association leaders by 1902 were outlining a program for teacher education consisting of: a broad general college education; professional education in the history of education, growth and development, curriculum and methods, and practice teaching; and graduate specialization in a subject field.

With these advances in the field of teacher education the stage was set for the adoption of an initial graduate requirement.

CHAPTER V

ADOPTION OF THE FIFTH-YEAR REQUIREMENT

In view of all of the demands for improved teacher education and the prevailing educational climate cited in the previous chapters it was understandable that a movement toward adding graduate work would materialize. This chapter will relate how the fifth-year requirement was adopted.

I. ONE HALF-YEAR REQUIRED FIRST

The University of California Requires One-half Year of Graduate Study

The University of California led the way by requiring one-half year of graduate study for high school teaching candidates. This was announced in the University of California Register of 1901-1902 (see Appendix C for full quotation).

The same amount of work in Education is required for the recommendation for a grammar grade certificate as is required for the recommendation for a high school certificate. Special Note. Candidates for the teachers' recommendation, of either the grammar or the high school grade, who are graduated with the class of 1905, or any succeeding class, may receive such recommendation only on the satisfactory completion of at last /sic/ one-half year of resident work in the graduate status. Such candidates must have satisfied the requirements of Special, Professional, and General Knowledge enumerated above; and at least one of the courses offered in satisfaction

of the requirement of Special Knowledge, and one of the courses offered in satisfaction of the requirement of Professional Knowledge, must have been completed in the graduate status. The half-year in the graduate status must represent at least nine units of regularly registered work, not including courses taken in the summer session.¹

Here, then was the first requirement to be made by higher education calling for study beyond the baccalaureate degree for high school teachers. Such developments did not go unnoticed in the education world. At the National Education Association Convention of 1902 the following resolution was adopted:

We heartily commend every step which may be taken for increasing the necessary qualifications of teachers, and hope soon to see as definite standard for the training of teachers as is now fixed by the best schools in the country for the training of physicians and lawyers. We believe that the fixing of such a standard and a strict adherence to it would elevate the work of the teacher to that of a profession.²

The headway made by the requirement of one-half year of graduate study led to proposals for further improvement.

Brown points out a noteworthy finding that indicated to the University of California that graduates of some liberal arts colleges were better prepared for high school teaching than were their own graduates.

¹University of California Register, 1901-1902, p. 91.

²National Education Association, "Resolutions of the Convention of 1902," Western Journal of Education, VII (August, 1902), p. 439.

In 1903 W. Scott Thomas was appointed examiner of high schools for the University. In the discharge of his duties in examining the classroom work of the high school teachers of the state he found that many teachers, trained at the University of California were not fully able to meet the demands made upon them. At the same time he discovered that graduates from some of the smaller private liberal arts colleges of this and eastern states, were often proving to be better prepared and more versatile teachers, due to the fact that major subject requirements were less exacting, which allowed more time for the preparation for teaching in the field of their college minors.³

A Full Year of Graduate Study Recommended in 1903

Thomas recommended a full year of graduate study rather than only a half year. The extra time would permit a requirement that a teacher must be prepared to instruct in one major and at least two minor subjects commonly taught in high school.⁴ Such interest in, and advocacy of, new certification requirements was indicative of the recognized need for higher certification standards for high school teachers.

An examination of how the new requirements of the credentialing law of 1901 were functioning would serve, at this time, to indicate whether the provisions of the law were

³Sherman S. Brown, "The History of the Training and Certification of Teachers in California" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, The University of California, Berkeley, 1931), p. 97.

⁴Ibid.

proving to be workable and beneficial to the state's education system. According to Frederick Burk, President of the San Francisco State Normal School, who reviewed California education at the close of 1902, the new certification law of 1901 not only was operating satisfactorily, it was exceeding the expectations of its promoters.⁵ The spirit of the new law was so evident that few teachers were attempting to use the examination shortcut to a certificate. "Nearly all of the private cramming schools," said Burk, "have been closed."⁶

It was now up to the universities and the normal schools, observed Burk, to see that they were doing an adequate job of preparing teachers.⁷ Here there was room for improvement since the universities had not yet provided training schools.⁸ Burk places some of the blame for this on the departments of the universities outside the field of education.

There has been a lethargy in the administrative departments of the universities and a seeming callousness to the needs of the schools for well trained university graduates as teachers . . . depending upon some sort of private feuds

⁵Frederick Burk, "A Review of Education in California for the Past Year," Western Journal of Education, VIII (January, 1903), pp. 24-36.

⁶Ibid., p. 24.

⁷Ibid., p. 25.

⁸Ibid., p. 25-26.

among the various university departments
inimical to the pedagogical departments. . . .⁹

It was President Burk's belief that, with the return of Professor Elmar Brown to the University of California and Professor Ellwood Cubberley to Stanford after a year's travel and study the situation would be remedied.¹⁰

There were still, however, some rumblings of dissatisfaction heard from county superintendents who did not appreciate their loss to the State Board of Education of the control of certification.¹¹

Harr Wagner, Editor of the Western Journal of Education, among others, wrote to pour oil on the troubled waters resulting from this difference in points of view.

We do not believe that the present plan of certificating high-school teachers is the best possible plan, but we do believe that it is so greatly superior to (County Board Control) that such a change can hardly be seriously discussed.¹²

The County Superintendents examined the problem at their meeting in December 1904 and adopted the following resolution: "Resolved, That we favor the present method of

⁹Ibid., p. 26.

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹Mark Keppel, "County Board of Education," Western Journal of Education, IX (March, 1904), p. 271.

¹²Harr Wagner, "The County Boards and the High Schools," Western Journal of Education, IX (February, 1904), p. 66.

certification of high school teachers."¹³

This marked an end of their opposition to the credential law of 1901 and swung their support more fully behind the State Board of Education.

One final sign-post pointing to the need for better teacher education and thus leading to the fifth-year requirement was an observation by George F. Brown concerning shortcomings in college programs. He noted that:

When the high schools employ teachers with only an elementary normal school training they find them pedagogically trained, perhaps, but wanting in scholarship. Their range of knowledge is too limited for the training they are expected to give. When they employ university graduates they find them strong in scholarship, perhaps, but with no pedagogical training or insight. Something ought to be done in a university which sends teachers into the high schools to open up to them the large field of pedagogic knowledge they have not entered, and reveal to them the conditions of successful teaching, other than a knowledge of the subjects taught.¹⁴

The need existed for a university type of education which also included work in the field of professional education.

State Board Requires One Half-year of Graduate Study

¹³County Boards of Education, "Resolutions of the Meeting of December, 1904," Western Journal of Education, X (March, 1905), p. 201.

¹⁴George F. Brown, "The University Must Train High School Teachers," Western Journal of Education, X (March, 1905), p. 330.

The next big step taken in the State to improve these existing conditions was to add a graduate study requirement. The State Board of Education had established a three man high school credentials committee of the following State Board members: Elmer E. Brown, University of California; M.E. Dailey and Frederick Burk, Presidents of the Normal Schools at San Jose and San Francisco respectively.¹⁵

The committee submitted its report at the State Board meeting of January 19, 1905 in Sacramento. The report recommended the addition of a requirement of one-half year of graduate study for the high school credential.

The Board adopted the recommendation in the following form:

On and after this date, and until further notice, high school certificates may be granted according to law, as provided in the same sections, subdivisions and paragraphs to graduates of approved colleges and universities who have taken courses in the theory of education or in the actual practice of teaching, under supervision of the pedagogical faculty, equivalent to twelve hours per week for one-half year; and who, since receiving the bachelor's degree, have completed one-half year of advanced academic or professional (pedagogical) work, in residence, either at the same institution or at some approved institution, or, in lieu of such graduate study, have taught with decided success, as regular

¹⁵California State Board of Education, "Minutes of the Meeting of September 10, 1904," Western Journal of Education, IX (October, 1904), p. 742.

teacher or as principal, at least twenty months in any reputable school, elementary or secondary.¹⁶

The State of California thus for the first time officially required graduate study in a segment of its credentialing program.

Bulletin No. 59 of the State Department of Education, June 3, 1905 put into effect this one-half year of graduate study requirement which was the same as the University of California required of its graduates.¹⁷

II. FULL FIFTH-YEAR REQUIRED OF SECONDARY TEACHERS

The State Board of Education continued to press for higher requirements. At its August 5, 1905 meeting in Sacramento it passed a resolution calling for a joint conference of the State Board and five University of California faculty members to revise the high school certification rules. C.C. Van Liew was appointed a committee of one to prepare a revision of the present rules to serve as a basis of discussion. The conference was to be held in San Francisco in

¹⁶California State Board of Education, "Minutes of the Meeting of January 19, 1905," Western Journal of Education, X (February, 1905), p. 120.

¹⁷California State Department of Education, "Bulletin No. 59, Law and Rules for High School Certificates," Western Journal of Education, X (July, 1905), pp. 616-618.

connection with the next Board meeting.¹⁸

Meeting of the State Board on December 4-5, 1905

The next meeting of the State Board of Education was held, as planned, in San Francisco on December 4th and 5th, 1905. It was at this meeting that the fifth-year requirement was initially adopted (see Appendix E for complete Board minutes).

The Board was composed entirely of professional educators with the exception of Governor George C. Pardee, who was not in attendance. Those present were: Morris E. Dailey, President of the San Jose State Normal School; J.F. Millspough, President of the Los Angeles State Normal School; C.C. Van Liew, President of the Chico State Normal School; Samuel T. Black, President of the San Diego State Normal School, and presiding Board Chairman in the absence of Governor Pardee; Frederick L. Burk, President of the San Francisco State Normal School; F.B. Dresslar, Professor of Pedagogy, University of California; and Thomas J. Kirk, Superintendent of Public Instruction.¹⁹

¹⁸California State Board of Education, "Minutes of the Meeting of August 5, 1905," Western Journal of Education, X (September, 1905), p. 723.

¹⁹California State Board of Education, "Minutes of the Meeting of December 4-5, 1905," Western Journal of Education, Vol. VI (January, 1906), p. 49.

The Board held its conference to discuss high school certification with the following five University of California faculty members: Irving Stringham, Wm. Carey Jones, E.C. Moore, and A.F. Lange, and later L.H. Richardson.²⁰

President C.C. Van Liew presented the recommendations stemming from this meeting:

In pursuance of a resolution adopted by this Board at the meeting held on August 5, 1905, a conference was held between the State Board of Education and a committee from the faculty of the University of California, in this City on December 4, 1905 for the purpose of formulating rules and regulations within the powers and duties of the State Board of Education for the granting of high school certificates which would be clear and definite and that would be satisfactory to those who desire to have California maintain her high standard for secondary teachers.

At such conference the following statements or resolutions were adopted as expressing the views of the members in this question. . . .

Four things are the evident interest of the law:

- a. That a high grade of both academic and pedagogical efficiency be maintained, the State University being taken as the academic standard;
- b. That the State Board of Education shall be the sole judge of the professional standards to be maintained, and of the equivalence of credentials to University of California standards;
- c. That nothing in the standards set by the general regulations of the Board shall unjustly prevent the certification of fit individuals who cannot technically meet the requirements of such rules;

²⁰ Ibid.

- d. That no state institutions, nor set of state institutions, as such, shall be permitted to control secondary certification. The aim is squarely the efficiency of the secondary teaching service. The responsible judge and authority is the State Board of Education.²¹

The conference felt that the standards of professional competency should be high and should be approximately the same for all. In this vein they made recommendations for determining compliance with these high standards of professional competence. The recommendations included one year of graduate study.²²

Adoption of the fifth-year requirement. The Board accepted and approved the recommendations of the joint conference and appointed a committee of Presidents Millspaugh, Van Liew and Wheeler to formulate rules in accordance with the recommendations of the conference.

This committee presented its recommendations which were nearly word for word the same as those that the joint conference had developed, on the afternoon of December 5, 1905.

The report read:

1. High school certificates may be issued under the provisions of Section 1521, Sub. 2(a), and Section 1775, 1(a) of the Political Code of

²¹Ibid., pp. 52-53.

²²Ibid., p. 53.

California, as follows:

To candidates who have received the Bachelor's Degree from a college requiring not less than eight years of high school and college training, and who submit evidence that in addition to the courses required for the Bachelor's Degree, they have successfully completed at least one year of graduate study in a University belonging to the Association of American Universities; which year of graduate study shall include one half-year of advanced academic study (part of the time, at least, being devoted to one or more of the subjects taught in the high school), and such other time in a well-equipped training school of secondary grade directed by the Department of Education of any one of the Universities of the Association, as may be necessary to fulfill the pedagogical requirements prescribed by this Board.²³

This rule was adopted on a roll call vote:

Ayes: Dailey, Millspaugh, Van Liew, Wheeler, Dresslar, Kirk, and Black; 7; Noes, none, Burk not voting.²⁴

It was further ordered that these rules take effect, "August 1, 1906."²⁵

Bulletin No. 99 on "High School Certification," effective on August 1, 1906, placed the rules adopted by the State Board into effect. It also reiterated the Board's rule on what constituted the minimum amount of pedagogy which Section 1521, Subdivision 2(a) of the Political Code, directed the State Board of Education to prescribe.

²³Ibid., p. 59.

²⁴Ibid., p. 60.

²⁵Ibid.

This minimum amount of professional education (in addition to the one half-year of advanced academic study) was to consist of an additional half-year to make the total one year of graduate study.

The one half-year of professional study required:

Satisfactory completion of courses, suitable and essential to acquiring efficient skill in teaching and an intelligent comprehension of the scope, and the attainable goals in high school instruction; said courses to be equivalent to not less than twelve hours per week for one half-year; provided, that at least one third of this work shall consist of practical teaching under the direction of supervising instructors of academic competency and breadth of pedagogic comprehension who for a period of not less than two years have taught the subjects in which they supervise.²⁶

However an unforeseen delay in implementation came in the form of the earthquake of April 18, 1906. In view of this emergency and due to the rules not being fully understood by graduates of the University of California and Stanford University, the requirements "adopted December 5, 1905" were postponed until "December 1, 1906" for "such graduates."²⁷ Regardless of this delay, California became the first state to require a fifth-year of preparation for

²⁶California State Department of Education, "Bulletin No. 99, High School Certification," Western Journal of Education, XI (August, 1906), pp. 47-51.

²⁷California State Department of Education, Minutes, Vol. III, September 21, 1906, p. 339.

teaching certification at the high school level. The basic premise that a professional education for teaching in the secondary schools demanded additional preparation beyond the baccalaureate degree had become established.

Alexis F. Lange, who had succeeded Elmer Brown as Head of the Department of Education at the University of California, spoke for everyone who had worked so hard to achieve the fifth-year requirement when he said:

The State Board of Education never did a thing worthier of leadership than when it broke away from antiquated tradition by prescribing at least a half year of academic graduate study at institutions where such study is carried on . . . another half year has been added to make room for educational theory and practice. Well done!²⁸

Summary

With the climate of secondary education being conducive to higher teaching requirements, and with professional educators advocating better teacher education and selection, the adoption of a graduate requirement was a reasonable development.

The University of California acted first. Under the existing State provisions that teacher candidates must obtain the University's recommendation for teacher credentials, the

²⁸Alexis F. Lange, "The Training of Teachers in Secondary Schools," Western Journal of Education, XII (January, 1907), p. 32.

University stipulated one half-year of graduate study as a requirement for the recommendation. The one half-year included both academic and professional study.

The value of a broad, liberal arts type of education for secondary teachers was also recognized since the graduates of some liberal arts colleges were doing a better job of high school teaching than were university graduates who could not teach as many subjects in the broadening high school curriculum. As a result, in 1903 a full year of graduate study was being recommended in order for teachers to gain more knowledge in minor subject areas.

While the new State-wide law of 1901, (which based certification on credentials) was functioning very well, it was recognized that the universities had to strive harder to provide adequate practice teaching opportunity for their teacher candidates.

In order to strengthen the teacher preparation program the State Board in January, 1905, followed the lead of the University and adopted the one half-year of graduate work as a requirement for high school certification.

The State Board did not stop here, but rather continued to press for higher requirements. A conference was held bringing together State Board members and five University of California faculty members. The recommendation of this group was that one year of graduate study should be required.

On December 5, 1905, the State Board of Education (made up except for the Governor, exclusively of professional educators) adopted the fifth-year requirement for the high school teaching certificate. The year was to include: one half-year of advanced academic study including the study of subjects taught in high schools, and one half-year of professional study to include courses suitable to acquiring teaching skill and comprehension of educational goals, as well as practice teaching.

The effective date of this requirement was August 1, 1906, with a later effective date of December 1, 1906 for University of California and Stanford graduates due to difficulty caused by the San Francisco earthquake.

With this adoption of the fifth-year requirement, California established high school teaching as a profession requiring its own specialized graduate preparation.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. SUMMARY

The adoption of the fifth-year requirement for the secondary credential in 1905, with implementation in 1906, was the result of the convergence and melding of many factors. Had some of these elements not been present or had they not reached a requisite level of development, the adoption probably would not have taken place.

That all these factors did come to focus at such an early date in California reveals why this state anteceded any other state by over a quarter of a century in adopting the fifth-year requirement for secondary school teachers (the District of Columbia and Arizona were next in 1933 and 1936 respectively).¹ It also aids in understanding that some states today still do not require five years of teacher preparation while California has extended the requirement to include elementary as well as secondary teachers.²

¹Henry Harap, Teacher Preparation: Fifth-Year Programs (Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, United States Department of Health Education and Welfare, 1961), p. 3.

²California Education Code, Division 10, Chap. 2, Art. 1.5, sec. 13189, 1961.

Factors Leading to the Fifth-Year Requirement

1. Oversupply of teachers. The first of these basic factors leading to the fifth-year requirement for high school certification was the oversupply of secondary teachers existent at the time of its adoption. Beattie indicated that this annual oversupply approximated six hundred. Many of these teachers were poorly equipped to teach in secondary schools, yet because of low certification standards, were authorized to do so.

Since there were more certificated high school teachers than there were high school positions, there was severe competition for these positions. This served to depress salaries and often resulted, observed Samuel T. Black and C.C. Van Liew, in the hiring of inferior teachers simply because they would agree to work for lower salaries.

With the University of California and Stanford University able to supply nearly twice as many secondary teachers as there existed high school positions in 1900, the certification standards could be appreciably raised without creating any shortage. At the same time such action would prevent unqualified teachers from receiving certificates. These "home-made" teachers, as State Superintendent Allen called them, could thus be eliminated.

2. Professional educators recommending standards.

The second requisite factor was the existence of a united body of professional educators outlining and seeking a better educational program for teachers. The National Education Association, as shown in the recommendations of the Committee of Fifteen; the California Teachers Association in their Conventions of 1901-02 and the work of the Sanford Committee in 1896; college and university faculties, and other teachers' groups and educators in the State developed and fought for, standards necessary for adequate preparation.

These standards included the following:

(1) A broad liberal education such as that advocated by the California Teachers Association. This advocacy was evidenced in the report of the Sanford Committee. Further expression of support for the liberal education of teachers was voiced at California Teachers Association conventions by C.C. Van Liew, president of the California Teachers Association, and by F.B. Dresslar of the University of California.

(2) Professional study in the history of education, child growth and development, methodology and curriculum which these men and the California Teachers Association also promoted.

(3) Practice teaching adequately supervised which Dresslar, Van Liew and the County Superintendents of Schools felt was the best way to identify good teaching candidates.

(4) Depth of preparation in a major area. This was also supported by the State's educators, but it was Dresslar who recommended that this depth be gained in graduate school.

(5) Preparation in minor areas of high school teaching. This was voiced best by W. Scott Thomas of the University of California faculty who observed in high school teachers a lack of preparation in minor areas of teaching.

3. Professional leadership. A third element was the presence of competent and dynamic educational leadership in California. The California Teachers Association was especially significant in fulfilling this role. It included all segments of education and men like State Superintendents Black, Kirk and Swett; State Normal School Presidents Van Liew, Burk and Dailey; and Brown and Dresslar of the University of California; all top educational leaders of the State, were its leaders. The committees and commissions of the California Teachers Association were instrumental in promoting educational progress by studying and making recommendations concerning teacher education.

The influential State Board of Education which evidenced its leadership by adopting the fifth-year requirement, was composed, except for the Governor, entirely of professional educators.

Many active leaders in the drive for better educated

teachers came from the ranks of the county and city superintendents of schools. Of special note were Superintendent Doub of Kern County who advocated practice teaching and Superintendent Furlong of San Rafael who supported University recommendation as a requirement for teacher certification.

The faculty of the University of California and those of other institutions of higher education were active in the area of teacher education.

The leadership exercised by all of these groups was greatly enhanced by the coordination among them. Their cooperation was facilitated through many men who belonged to, and worked in, two or more of the groups.

4. Centralized control of certification. Evolutionary changes in certification leading toward centralized State control was a fourth factor important in leading to the fifth-year requirement. These changes included the use of credentials, in the form of college diplomas, rather than examinations as the basis for certification as provided in the laws of 1891 and 1893. The centralization also included the vesting, through the certification law of 1901, of certification power in the hands of the State Board of Education rather than in local boards. The abuses and the inadequacies of local control and the failure of the examination system were recognized in the scandals of 1878. Of course there

were setbacks such as the return to localized control in 1879, but these were small setbacks in the over-all progression toward centralization.

With the controlling power for certification in State hands, as the result of the credential laws of 1893 and 1901, uniform and higher standards could be established and enforced as contrasted to a multiplicity of differing requirements under individual county and city control.

5. Sound, broad system of secondary education. As a fifth necessary element the growth and development of the high school system had reached a point requiring better prepared teachers. By 1905 there were one hundred and seventy-seven high schools in the State. The scope and depth of curricular offerings in the high-schools were such that teachers needed to be better prepared in depth of subject matter knowledge and in breadth of subjects they could teach.

Also the high school system was financially State supported under provisions of the Rowell Act of 1903, and was healthy, respected and growing.

6. College selection of teachers. A sixth and key factor making possible the adoption of the fifth-Year requirement was the provision in the certification law of 1881, that candidates for a secondary credential must be recommended by the college or colleges at which they receive their

education. Such a recommendation was deemed to be even more important than the college degree itself by some educators including State Superintendent Black who felt it would be unpardonable to issue a teaching certificate without such a recommendation. This had the effect of indicating that the colleges could require additional work beyond a Bachelor's degree.

The University of California thus was able to require, in 1901, a half-year of graduate work. This requirement was the direct forerunner of the full, fifth-year requirement.

7. Colleges responsible for the educational program.

A final contingent factor was evidenced when the responsibility for ensuring proper teacher education was taken away from examining boards and placed in the hands of the colleges and universities by the provisions of the credential laws of 1893 and 1901.

These institutions, in order to do a sound job, and in order to be able to give a valid recommendation to a candidate, had to improve not only their teacher education programs but had to decide properly who should receive a recommendation.

In order to do this, the institutions adopted more comprehensive programs (as outlined above in the standards recommended by professional educators) and required student teaching in accordance with a State Board of Education

requirement adopted in 1902. This higher quality teacher education demanded more than four years to accomplish and led directly to graduate requirements.

With all of these factors present the State of California initiated the five-year program of teacher education by adopting, in 1905, and implementing in 1906, its fifth-year requirement for high school teachers.

II. CONCLUSIONS

Principles Established by, and Reflected in, the Adoption of the Fifth-Year Requirement

Evident in this adoption were certain basic principles of sound teacher education. While all of these concepts had roots in the history and development of certification, it was in the adoption of the fifth-year requirement that they were brought sharply into focus and became firmly established.

Roles of the Various Agencies

The first of these principles concerned the roles that various agencies had in teacher certification.

1. Role of the State. The position of the State in certification now was dominant over that of local authorities. State-wide control with one uniform set of State credentialing requirements prevailed rather than individual autonomy by counties or local school districts.

2. Role of State Legislature. The role of the State legislature was that of passing the basic enabling acts to carry out their Constitutional commitments. Concerning secondary credentialing the legislature's only charges to the State Board of Education were that any credentials presented for certification must be based upon the equivalent of a bachelor's degree from the University of California; that a minimum amount of teacher education should be prescribed by the board; and that a candidate must be recommended by a college. The legislature charged the State Board of Education to prescribe the general rules for certification.

Thus the concept of the legislature's role in certification was that the legislature left the specifics of certification to professional educators.

3. Role of the State Board. The State Board of Education and the State Department of Education saw their roles as those of developing minimum regulations and administering the certification regulations. In the wording of their adoption of the fifth-year requirement the State Board of Education revealed this concept.

4. Role of teacher education institutions. The main responsibility for prescribing the requirements upon which certification was to be based was left to the individual teacher education institutions themselves. This concept held

that it was the responsibility of the colleges to provide a sound, well-rounded education program both academically and professionally, for its teacher candidates.

Thus the principles of what the role of each agency should be in teacher certification were established.

5. Role of educational associations. The concept of where educational associations fit into the picture was also manifested in the adoption of the fifth-year requirement. Their value lay in their ability to provide leadership and concerted effort toward realizing desirable educational goals. They brought teachers, professional educators, and interested laymen together to share ideas, to study problems, and to make recommendations to the teacher education institutions, to the State Board, and to the Legislature.

Teacher Selection

The principle of the manner in which teachers were to be selected was also established. It was the responsibility of the teacher education institutions to develop their own standards and selection processes. It was also therefore their responsibility to see that only worthy candidates were granted credentials and recommendations from their institutions.

Teaching as a Profession

The expressed principle that the amount of preparation for teachers should be more than is required for a bachelor's degree established teaching as a true profession. As such it required specialized professional training beyond that of a baccalaureate degree.

Content of a Teacher Education Program

The concept of what should be the nature of a teacher education program was likewise established in the adoption of the fifth-year requirement. It was to include a broad general education, depth and breadth of subject matter study, professional education and student teaching. Such a program would provide secondary teachers with the firm base they would need in order not only to be successful teachers in the beginning but also to grow and develop throughout their careers.

This historical weaving of the story of the adoption of the fifth-year requirement has been the result of drawing together many threads of information from the annals of teacher education. The resultant fabric of such a study clearly shows the requirement to be a product of the events and successes of the movement for improved education for teachers. There can be but little doubt that these successes were achieved through concerted effort on the part of

professional educators striving for a profession of education. That they were successful in gaining some measure of this professional status is proved by the adoption of the fifth-year requirement for secondary teacher certification in California.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Since this study was concerned with the adoption of the fifth-year requirement, along with events leading up to the adoption, it was not within the scope of the study to cover current practices and requirements for fifth-year programs in California teacher education institutions. Such a study would be desirable and would serve to reveal whether the principles concerning the roles of the various agencies involved in certification had changed, and if so in what ways.

An historical study, similar to the one presented here, but concerning the adoption of recent certification regulations, would indicate what forces led to the passage of this legislation and what leadership was instrumental in its development and adoption.

A study could then be made comparing the manner in which the fifth-year requirement was adopted with that of the way in which current legislation and regulations are developed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Blauch, Lloyd E. (ed.) Education for the Professions.
United States Department of Health, Education, and
Welfare, Office of Education. Washington: Government
Printing Office, 1955.
- Carr - Saunders, A.M., and P.A. Wilson. The Professions.
London: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- Cloud, Roy W. Education in California. Stanford: Stanford
University Press, 1952.
- Knight, Edgar W. Education in the United States. New York:
Ginn and Company, 1951.
- _____, and Clifton L. Hall. Readings in American
Educational History. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts,
Inc., 1951.
- Swett, John. Public Education in California. New York:
American Book Company, 1911.

B. PERIODICALS

- Allen, Charles H. "The Supply of Teachers," Western Journal
of Education, IV (September, 1899), pp. 7-8.
- Beattie, G.W. "Certification of Teachers, The Duties of
County Boards of Education," Western Journal of
Education, V (May, 1900), pp. 21-24.
- Black, Samuel T. "The Certification of Teachers," Western
Journal of Education, II (December, 1897), p. 49.
- _____. "Recommendation to the Legislature,"
Western Journal of Education, IV (February, 1899),
p. 20.
- Brown, Elmer E. "The Selection of Teachers," Western
Journal of Education, II (November, 1897), pp. 10-11.

Brown, George F. "The University Must Train High School Teachers," Western Journal of Education, X (March, 1905), pp. 330-331.

Burk, Frederic. "A Review of Education in California for the Past Year," Western Journal of Education, VIII (January, 1903), pp. 24-36.

California. State Board of Education. "Minutes," Western Journal of Education. Official Organ of the State Board of Education, VIII (1903) through XII (1907).

_____. State Board of Education. "High School Certification." Bulletin Number 99. Western Journal of Education, XI (August, 1906), p. 47.

_____. State Department of Education. "Law and Rules for High School Certificates." Bulletin Number 59. Western Journal of Education, X (July, 1905), pp. 616-618.

_____. State Educational Commission. "Report of the Meeting of April 12, 1900," Western Journal of Education, V (May, 1900), pp. 18-20.

_____. State Educational Commission. "Sub-Committee Report of April 12, 1900," Western Journal of Education, V (April, 1900), pp. 19-20 and pp. 38-39.

County Boards of Education. "Resolutions of the Meeting of December, 1904," Western Journal of Education, X (March, 1905), pp. 199-206.

County and City Superintendents. "Proceedings of the Biennial Convention of 1900," Western Journal of Education, V (September, 1900), pp. 25-36.

County and City Superintendents. "Resolutions of the Biennial Convention of 1896," Western Journal of Education, II (August, 1896), p. 2.

Dresslar, F.B. "The Present Duty of the State Touching the Training of its Elementary and Secondary Teachers." Proceedings of the California Teachers' Association Convention of 1901-1902. Western Journal of Education, VII (March, 1902), pp. 167-170.

- Doub, W.C. "The Preparation of Teachers by the State." Proceedings of the California Teachers' Association Convention of 1901-1902. Western Journal of Education, VII (March, 1902), pp. 181-184.
- Harrell, Alfred. "President's Address." San Joaquin Valley Teachers' Association Convention of 1897. Western Journal of Education, II (November, 1897), pp. 16-17.
- Keppel, Mark. "County Board of Education," Western Journal of Education, IX (March, 1904), pp. 271-274.
- Kinney, Lucien B. "The Development of the Five-Year Program of Teacher Education in California," Educational Outlook, XVI (March, 1942), pp. 97-106.
- Lange, Alexis F. "The Training of Teachers in Secondary Schools," Western Journal of Education, XII (January, 1907), pp. 28-35.
- Napier, John H. Jr. "The Influence of the University of California Upon the Early Development of the Public High School," California Quarterly of Secondary Education, IX (April, 1934), p. 293, based on "The Origin and Development of the Public High School in California," by John H. Napier, Jr., Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1932.
-
- . "The Origin and Development of the Public High School in California," California Quarterly of Secondary Education, VIII (January, 1933), pp. 177-188, based on "The Origin and Development of the Public High School in California," by John H. Napier, Jr., Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1932.
-
- . "Private Secondary Education in California, 1850-1891," California Quarterly of Secondary Education, VIII (April, 1933), pp. 293-311, based on "The Origin and Development of the Public High School in California," by John H. Napier, Jr., Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1932.
-
- . "The Rise of the Public High School in California Prior to 1879," California Quarterly of Secondary Education, VIII (June, 1933), pp. 395-407, based on "The Origin and Development of the Public High School in California," by John H. Napier, Jr., Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1932.

Napier, John H. Jr. "The Rise of the Public High School in California Prior to 1879," California Quarterly of Secondary Education, IX (October, 1933), pp. 73-76, a continuation based on "The Origin and Development of the Public High School in California," by John H. Napier, Jr., Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1932.

. "The Rise of the Public High School in California Prior to 1879," California Quarterly of Secondary Education, IX (January, 1934), pp. 195-206, a continuation based on "The Origin and Development of the Public High School in California," by John H. Napier, Jr., Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1932.

National Education Association. "Resolutions of the Convention of 1902," Western Journal of Education, VII (August, 1902), p. 439.

Russell, J.E. "Teachers Are Under Educated," Western Journal of Education, VI (September, 1901), p. 18.

Stockton Teachers' Committee. "Resolutions," Western Journal of Education, I (August 1, 1895), p. 14.

Van Liew, C.C. "The Present Duty of the State Touching the Training of its Elementary and Secondary Teachers," Proceedings of the California Teachers' Association Convention of 1901-1902. Western Journal of Education, VII (March, 1902), pp. 154-167.

Wagner, Harr. "The County Boards and the High Schools," Western Journal of Education, IX (February, 1904), p. 66.

C. CONSTITUTIONS, STATUTES, AND STATE LITERATURE

California. Annual Reports of the Superintendent of Public Instruction from 1852 through 1863. Sacramento: State Printing Office.

. Biennial Reports of the Superintendent of Public Instruction from 1864 through 1906. Sacramento: State Printing Office.

California Education Code. Division 10, Chap. 2, Art. 1.5, sec. 13189, 1961.

California State Board of Education. Minutes. Unpublished. On file in the office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Sacramento.

California Statutes. Sessions for the years 1850 through 1906. Sacramento: State Printing Office.

California State Constitution. 1849. Sacramento: State Printing Office.

_____. 1879. Sacramento: State Printing Office.

California State Constitutional Amendment. Adopted 1902. Sacramento: State Printing Office.

California (State) University. Berkeley. Register. 1901-02, pp. 90-92 and p. 272.

Hoitt, Ira G. "Certificates," Fourteenth Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction 1889-1890, pp. 25-26. Sacramento: State Printing Office.

Kirk, Thomas J. "State Recognition of High Schools," Twentieth Biennial Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction 1901-1902, pp. 7-8, 11-13. Sacramento: State Printing Office.

McChesney, J.B. "Secondary Education in California," Twenty-first Biennial Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction 1903-1904, pp. 114-129. Sacramento: State Printing Office.

D. BULLETINS AND REPORTS

Armstrong, W. Earl, and T.M. Stinnett. A Manual on Certification Requirements for School Personnel in the United States. National Education Association. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1959.

Black, Samuel T. "The Certification of Teachers," Proceedings of the California Teachers' Association Convention, pp. 63-73. San Francisco: The Association, 1897.

Black, Samuel T. "The County Board - Its Duties and Opportunities," Proceedings of the California Teachers' Association Convention, p. 40. San Francisco: The Association, 1899.

Brown, Elmer E. "Address," Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Session of the Northern Section of the California Teachers' Association, p. 26. Willows, California: Colusa Sun Job Rooms, 1903.

Burk, Frederick. "California's Present Duty to Her Educational Future," Proceedings of the California Teachers' Association Convention, pp. 25-36. San Francisco: The Association, 1899.

Furlong, Robert. "Report of the Committee on Certification of Teachers," Proceedings of the California Teachers' Association Convention, pp. 136-139. San Francisco: The Association, 1899.

Harap, Henry. Teacher Preparation: Fifth Year Programs. United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1961.

Johnson, Frederic Ferley. "The Organization of Instruction in High Schools," Proceedings of the Third Annual Session of the Northern Section of the California Teachers' Association, pp. 60-69. San Francisco: The Association, 1898.

National Education Association. Proceedings of the National Education Association Convention of 1892, p. 247. Saratoga Springs, New York: The Association, 1892.

. The Report of the Committee of Fifteen. New York: The American Book Company, 1895.

. The Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies. New York: The American Book Company, 1894.

Sanford, Fernando. "Report of the Committee on High School Certificates," Proceedings of the California Teachers' Association Convention, pp. 42-43. San Francisco: The Association, 1896.

Van Liew, C.C. "Report of the Committee on the President's Address," Proceedings of the California Teachers' Association Convention, pp. 141-142. San Francisco: The Association, 1899.

E. THESES AND DISSERTATIONS

Archer, Ellis Charles. "A Proposed Revision of the California Credential Structure." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1956.

Brown, Sherman S. "The History of the Training and Certification of Secondary Teachers in California." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of California, 1931.

Burkman, Joel Andrew. "Teachers' Permanent Certificates and Professional Growth." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, The University of California, Berkeley, 1931.

Cain, Leo F. "The Development of Teacher Certification in California." Unpublished Master's thesis, Stanford University, 1935.

Chu, Buoymun Mary. "State Policies and Programs in the Certification of Teachers in California from 1890 to 1940." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1946.

Lin, Henry C. "Origin and Development of Teacher Training in California." Unpublished Master's thesis, Stanford University, 1930.

Miller, Frank Byron. "A Study of the Certification of Teachers in the State of California, 1849 to 1880." Unpublished Master's thesis, Stanford University, 1931.

Von Schlichten, Erwin Walter. "A Study in Teacher Certification: the Story of the Five Year Requirement in New York State." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1956.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

CALIFORNIA STATE EDUCATIONAL COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT

AT THE SAN FRANCISCO MEETING, APRIL 12, 1900

Edward F. Adams, Wrights
Alden Anderson, Suisun
James A. Barr, Stockton
G.W. Beattie, Berkeley
H.M. Bland, San Jose
Elmer E. Brown, Berkeley
John E. Budd, Stockton
Frederic Burk, San Francisco
Rev. T.F. Burnham, Vallejo
C.W. Childs, San Jose
Ellwood P. Cubberley, Stanford Univ.
Horace Davis, San Francisco
Dr. E.R. Dille, Oakland
F.E. Dunlap, Stockton
Robert Furlong, San Rafael
Mr. Julia Hughes Gilbert, Stanford Univ.
James W. Graham, Hanford
Will S. Green, Colusa
Mrs. Phoebe A. Hearst, San Francisco
Timothy Hopkins, San Francisco
Edward Hyatt, Riverside
Pres. David Starr Jordon, Stanford Univ.
Supt. Thomas J. Kirk, Sacramento
E.O. Lardins, Visalia
J.W. Linscott, Santa Cruz
Charles F. Lummis, Los Angeles
C.W. Mark, San Francisco
W.S. Melick, Pasadena
Frank Morton, San Francisco
Charles A. Murdock, San Francisco
C.L. McLane, Fresno
J.B. McChesney, Oakland
J.W. Mc Clymonds, Oakland
Mayor James D. Phelan, San Francisco
Senator Chester A. Rowell, Fresno
Arthur Rogers, San Francisco
R.M. Shackelford, Paso Robles
P.W. Smith, Auburn
Judge Edward Sweeney, Redding
John Swett, Martinez
George L. Sackett, Ventura

R.H. Webster, San Francisco
H. Weinstock, Sacramento
Pres. Benjamin Ide Wheeler, Berkeley
E.B. Willis, Sacramento

Total 45

"California State Education Commission," Western Journal of Education, V (May, 1900), p. 18.

APPENDIX B

REPORT TO THE CALIFORNIA EDUCATIONAL COMMISSION

"During the first half of the school history of California, practically all teachers' certificates were based on examinations by local or state boards. Since 1879, the county boards have been the examining bodies. The first normal school law in California, passed in 1862, provided that the diplomas and certificates of qualification issued to graduates should entitle the holders thereof to teach in any school in the state of the grade specified therein, for the term of two years, without further examination. From this small beginning, the list of credentials that the state has recognized as evidence of fitness, for teaching, without further examination, has grown till it today includes:

(I) Diplomas from all California State Normal Schools, and from Normal schools of other states, University of Calif. diplomas, and diplomas from Stanford, Harvard, Yale, Johns Hopkins, and most of the other leading universities of the United States;

(II) Certain grades of certificates issued by the

G.W. Beattie, "Certification of Teachers. The Duties of County Boards of Education," Western Journal of Education, V (May, 1900), pp. 21-24. (A contribution to the discussion of the topic by the California Educational Commission April 12, 1900).

various County Boards in California, and life diplomas from other states. The second class, as a rule, is based on some formal examination without reference to special training.

"For many years the methods of certificating on examination and on credentials have been working side by side, most of the time on an equal footing, so far as the law was concerned. During this time, simply by reason of its intrinsic superiority, the credential has been steadily supplanting the examination. Of the grammar grade certificates, exclusive of the life and educational diplomas of that grade, now existing in the state, 4,175 have been issued on credentials, and only 1,970 on examination, while in the high school grade the examination is already obsolete. Answers to inquiries as to the number of high school certificates granted under each of the two methods within the past year in the different counties of the state, give the following results:

The fifty-seven counties report a total of thirty-one on examination and 234 on credentials. Forty-two counties issuing fifty-two percent of all high school certificates granted last year have made no use whatever of the examination privilege.

"Let us now consider the supply of certificated teachers, both present and prospective, and the demand for the same.

"As the state has been rapidly moving toward the credential basis, a question naturally arises whether the

less desirable method of certificating by examination can be wholly dispensed with without inconvenience to the schools. An interesting and extensive investigation, rendered possible by the hearty co-operation of Superintendent of Public Instruction Thomas J. Kirk, Prof. Elmer E. Brown of the University of California, and the County Superintendents of the fifty-seven counties in the state, is now completed, and throws needed light on the question of present supply and demand. The County Superintendents have furnished lists of the certificated teachers in their respective counties, and these have been combined, freed from duplicates, and indexed by Mr. James U. Smith, a graduate student in the Department of Pedagogy in the University of California.

"In preparing these lists the County Superintendents were instructed to omit from the same all papers standing in the names of deceased persons, and of persons known to have retired permanently from the business of teaching.

"I am now able to present the results of this investigation. A partial report was made by me during the State Association meeting in Sacramento last December. Of valid certificates now outstanding in the state, there are:

High School Diplomas	201
" " Educational Diplomas	38
" " Certificates on Credentials	742
" " Certificates on Examination	<u>205</u>
Total High School Certificates	1186

Grammar Grade Life Diplomas	1988	
" " Educational Diplomas	797	
" " Normal Documents	440	
" " Certificates on Credentials	3735	
" " Certificates on Examination	<u>1970</u>	
Total Grammar Grade Certificates		8930

Primary Certificates	1703	
Special Certificates	349	
Kindergarten Certificates	<u>197</u>	
Total High School Certificates		12365

By the same investigation it is shown that the number of new teachers, i.e., persons who have never taught in California public schools prior to the year 1899, is - - - - - 567

As given in the report of the State Superintendent for the year 1899.

The total number of teachers' positions in California is - - - - -	7438
The total number of high school positions is - - - - -	495

"Thus it will be seen that for 495 high school positions, there are 1,186 persons provided with high school certificates, and for the remaining 6,943 positions there is an army of 11,870 certificated teachers available, if we include teachers holding high school certificates who do not occupy high school positions.

"I have also some facts bearing on the question of prospective supply. The records of the State Normal Schools in California show the following:

Total number of students in next to highest classes from 1891-98 - - - - -	2982
Total number of graduates from these classes (1892-1899) - - - - -	1895
Total number of students now in next to highest classes - - - - -	565

"Using the ratio of the number of students in the classes selected for eight years to the total number graduated from the same as a basis for calculation, there should be 360 graduates from the five state normal schools in 1901. If we employ the ratio for the years 1898-1899, which is probably fairer, since in the eight year period there was a change from a three-year to a four-year course, which materially lessened the number of graduates for a time, the number should be 400.

"Thru [sic] the assistance of Dr. Elliott, registrar of Stanford University, and of Mr. Cheney, appointment secretary in the University of California, I am enabled to present a table showing the number of high school teachers recommended from the two universities since 1894 together with the number of new persons employed in the high schools of the state each year.

	1894	1895	1896	1897	1898	1899
Recommendations for high school Certificates at the Univ. of Calif.	40	60	67	72	126	110
Recommendations for high school Certificates at Stanford Univ.	<u>9</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>56</u>
Total	49	94	114	126	189	166
Number of new teachers employed in the high schools in the state	68	95	79	100	130	117
The recommendations in 1900 will probably exceed 200.						

"We may reasonably expect to have more than 600 professionally trained teachers per year certificated from the two universities and the five state normal schools by the

time any changes in our certificating laws can become operative. The reports from the counties show that only 567 new teachers were employed in all the schools in the state during the past year. Thus, with nearly two teachers certificated for every position in our public schools, our professional training-schools are supplying more teachers each year than there are vacancies in the entire state.

"The question next arises, --What is to be the future of the county boards?

"The Constitution of 1879 assigned to them specifically two duties:

1. The adoption of text-books for the schools of their counties.
2. The examination of applicants for teachers' certificates.

"The Legislature has from time to time given to them various other duties, the most important of which is the adoption of courses of study for the schools of their county not controlled by city boards of education.

"The Constitutional amendment of 1884 relieved county boards of responsibility concerning text books.

"The natural trend of events is fast taking from them the work that heretofore has constituted their chief occupation--the examination of applicants for teachers' certificates. The statistics just presented show that the \$50,000 a year required for the maintenance of these examina-

tions is not expended because the schools of the state need the untrained teachers who are certificated in this way. We are continuing a custom after having outgrown the conditions that called it into existence.

"The State has three possible courses open to it:

1. The present arrangement may be continued with its wasteful expenditure of money for things not needed.
2. By constitutional amendment the county boards may be abolished.
3. New duties may be assigned to these boards so that the existing machinery may be utilized for the attainment of needed ends.

"Personally, I believe the last course contains the proper solution of the problem. Expansion of supervisory duties seems to me most promising."

APPENDIX C

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA'S ONE HALF-YEAR OF GRADUATE STUDY REQUIREMENT

"The respective Faculties will issue, to qualified graduates of the University of any class not later than the class of 1904, recommendations for High School Certificates. For recommendation for the High School Certificate, the following requirements must be complied with:

"(a) SPECIAL KNOWLEDGE. Twenty units, normally in the subject or group of closely allied subjects that the candidate expects to teach; the ultimate decision as to the candidate's proficiency resting with the heads of the departments concerned (In some departments more than twenty units are necessary).

"(b) PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE. Eight units in education, and four units, either in Education or in the department in which the student seeks recommendation for a teacher's certificate. Recommended graduates of California State Normal Schools need not take these four units in the department in which they seek recommendations, but may take them in any other department or departments.

"(c) GENERAL KNOWLEDGE. Courses sufficient to repre-

sent (with the inclusion of Special Studies) four groups from the following list: Natural Sciences, Mathematics, English, Foreign Languages, History, Philosophy. This requirement is intended to secure, so far as is possible, breadth of culture and sympathy with the various lines of high school work.

"County and City Boards of Education have authority, under Sections 1775 and 1792 of the Political Code of California, to issue certificates of the high school grade without examination to graduates of the University when recommended by the Faculty. Hereafter, with the single exception noted below, such recommendations will be issued only to persons who have taken an academic degree and satisfied the requirements specified above.

"Graduate students who are granted a higher degree may receive the teacher's recommendation with that degree, provided they have complied with the above requirements. Under-graduates who propose remaining at the University for graduate study are advised to postpone a part or all of their pedagogical courses until their undergraduate course is completed. See the Regulations of the Graduate Department, especially the provision for a Higher Course of Professional Training for Teachers.

"Recommended graduates of the State Normal Schools of California may be granted the High School Teacher's

Recommendation on the completion of two years' work, provided they make their election of studies in conformity with the schedule of requirements given above. This course does not lead to an academic degree. In some cases the courses require more than two years' attendance. County and City Boards of Education have authority, under Section 1503 of the Political Code of California, to issue certificates of the high school grade to the graduates of any State Normal School of California who have successfully completed the two-year course in Education at the University, when recommended by the Faculty. But, by recent action of the State Legislature, the provisions of this paragraph lapse June 30, 1903.

"Upon petition to the Faculty, graduates of the University, of any class not later than the class of 1904, may receive recommendations for certificates of the grammar grade.

"The same amount of work in Education is required for the recommendation for a grammar grade certificate as is required for the recommendation for a high school certificate.

Special Note -- Candidates for the teacher's recommendation, of either the grammar or the high school grade, who are graduated with the class of 1905, or any succeeding class, may receive such recommendation only on the satisfactory completion of at last [sic] one half-year of resident work

in the graduate status. Such candidate must have satisfied the requirements of Special, Professional, and General knowledge enumerated above; and at least one of the courses offered in satisfaction of the requirement of Special Knowledge, and one of the courses offered in satisfaction of the requirement of Professional Knowledge, must have been completed in the graduate status. The half-year in the graduate status must represent at least nine units of regularly registered work, not including courses taken in the summer session."

"A HIGHER COURSE OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES FOR TEACHERS.

"The respective faculties will issue to holders of the Master's degree of this University, a Higher Recommendation for the Teacher's Certificate. Candidates for this Recommendation must satisfy either the one or the other of two schedules of requirements:

- (1) a schedule intended especially for those preparing to become teachers in normal schools, or principals or superintendents of public schools, or
- (2) a schedule intended especially for those preparing to become department teachers in secondary schools.

The work will usually require more than one year of study in the graduate department. The Recommendation will be limited to students who have given evidence of superior attainments in the practice of teaching; this requirement

APPENDIX D

CALIFORNIA STATE SUPERINTENDENTS OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

John G. Marvin	1851 - 1853
Paul K. Hubbs	1854 - 1856
Andrew J. Moulder	1857 - 1862
John Swett	1863 - 1867
Oscar P. Fitzgerald	1867 - 1871
Henry N. Bolander	1871 - 1875
Ezra S. Carr	1875 - 1879
Frederick M. Campbell	1880 - 1882
William T. Welcker	1883 - 1886
Ira G. Hoitt	1887 - 1890
James W. Anderson	1891 - 1894
Samuel T. Black	1895 - 1898
Charles T. Meredith	1898
Thomas J. Kirk	1899 - 1906
Edward Hyatt	1907 - 1918

Roy W. Cloud, Education in California (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1952), pp. 4-8.

APPENDIX E

MINUTES OF THE ADOPTION OF THE FIFTH-YEAR REQUIREMENT

"The meeting was called to order at 10 o'clock A.M., President Black of the State Normal School at San Diego presiding in the absence of Governor George C. Pardee.

"Roll call showed the following named members to be in attendance: Morris E. Dailey, President State Normal School, San Jose; J.F. Millsbaugh, President State Normal School, Los Angeles; C.C. Van Liew, President State Normal School, Chico; Samuel T. Black, President State Normal School, San Diego; Frederic L. Burk, President State Normal School, San Francisco; Dr. F.B. Dresslar, Professor of Pedagogy, University of California; Thomas J. Kirk, Superintendent of Public Instruction and ex-office Secretary State Board of Education.

"The following members were absent: Governor George C. Pardee, President of the Board; Benjamin Ide Wheeler, President of the University of California.

"In addition to the members of the Board present, the following members of the committee from the Faculty of the

"State Board of Education Meeting San Francisco, December 4-5, 1905," Western Journal of Education, XI (January, 1906), pp. 49-61.

University of California were present to meet the members of the State Board of Education in conference to discuss the powers and duties of the State Board regarding high school certificates: Irving Stringham, Wm. Carey Jones, E.C. Moore, and A.F. Lange, and later, L.H. Richardson.

"During the reading of the minutes of the last meeting of the Board it was moved and carried to defer the meeting of the Board until after the conference had been held. At 10:30 A.M. the Board therefore, took a recess, subject to the call of the chair.

"At 4 o'clock the chairman called the members of the Board together, the conference having completed its labors and adjourned. On roll call the same members were found to be in attendance that were present at the morning session, and also President Wheeler of the State University.

.....

"President Van Liew, the committee of one appointed at the last meeting of the Board to prepare a revision of present rules for high school certification to serve as a basis of discussion at the conference, stated that pursuant to said motion he had prepared a report which, together with a report submitted by the University Committee, had been considered at the conference, and that a report of the action taken at the conference would be submitted the next morning.

.....

"The Board convened at 10 o'clock A.M., December 5th, 1905, with all members present except Governor Pardee and President Wheeler of the University.

"It being the time fixed for the consideration of the conference report, the same was read by President Van Liew. It is as follows:

Gentlemen:--

"Your Committee on the Revision of Rules and Regulations for the granting of high school certificates begs leave to submit the following report:

"In pursuance of a resolution adopted by this Board at the meeting held on August 5th, 1905, a conference was held between the State Board of Education and a committee from the Faculty of the University of California, in this city on December 4, 1905 for the purpose of formulating rules and regulations within the powers and duties of the State Board of Education for the granting of high school certificates which would be clear and definite and that would be satisfactory to those who desire to have California maintain her high standard for secondary teachers.

"At such conference the following statements or resolutions were adopted as expressing the views of the members in this question, and the same respectfully submitted for the consideration of this Board:

"Four things are the evident intent of the law:

a. That a high grade of both academic and pedagogical efficiency be maintained, the State University being taken as the academic standard;

b. That the State Board of Education shall be the sole judge of the professional standards to be maintained, and of the equivalence of credentials to University of California standards;

c. That nothing in the standards set by the general regulations of the Board shall unjustly prevent the certification of fit individuals who cannot technically meet the requirements of such rules;

d. That no state institution, nor set of state institutions, as such, shall be permitted to control secondary certification. The aim is squarely the efficiency of the secondary teaching service. The responsible judge and authority is the State Board of Education.

"If the above (a to d) are the intent of the law, they constitute the test to apply to the rules enacted by this Board.

"Ample provision should be made so that anyone who may desire to do so may have the fullest opportunity to prove his fitness to receive the high school certificate, but the standard of professional competency should be high and approximately the same for all.

"Compliance with this standard of professional com-

petency should be determined in three ways:

"1. The candidate should have received the Bachelor's degree from a college requiring not less than eight years of high school and college training.

"Furthermore, the candidate should submit satisfactory evidence that in addition to the courses required for the Bachelor's degree he has successfully completed at least one year of graduate study in a University belonging to the American Association of Universities, which year of graduate study should include the equivalent of one-half year of advanced academic study (part of the time at least being devoted to one or more of the subjects taught in the high schools), and the equivalent of twelve hours per week of one half-year of professional work in courses specially designed for teachers, at least one-third of which should consist of actual teaching in a well-equipped training school of secondary grade (directed by the Department of Education of any one of the Universities of the Association); provided, that a portion of the theoretical study of education hereby required may at the discretion of the University recommending the candidate, be done in the undergraduate status; provided, further, that until July 1, 1908, practice teaching (together with accompanying conferences) in a school of grammar grade in connection with a California State Normal School, as evidenced by a certificate of proficiency, may be accepted

as an equivalent of such actual teaching in a well-equipped training school of secondary grade directed by the Department of Education of the University issuing such credentials. In case the candidate has received his post-graduate preparation in two institutions, each institution should issue to such candidate credentials to cover the work, both academic and professional, performed under its direction.

"2. Candidates who have received the Bachelor's degree from a college requiring an equivalent of not less than eight years of high school and college training and present satisfactory evidence that they have been graduated from a California State Normal School, or some other Normal School accredited by the State Board of Education, and have had accompanying training school experience, or that they have successfully completed in a University belonging to the American Association the equivalent of at least one half-year of graduate academic study (a part of the time at least being devoted to one or more of the subjects taught in the high school), in lieu of further professional training, should be permitted to submit evidence showing that they have taught with decided success, as regular teacher, or as principal, at least twenty months, in any reputable school, elementary or secondary, and receive the high school certificate.

"3. The Special High School Credential should also be issued upon examination, held by the State Board of Education.

"Grammar school credentials should no longer be issued by Universities which do not provide thorough professional training for grammar school teachers. Students in Universities or colleges who plan to become candidates for such credentials should be urged to seek their professional training in a State Normal School, after having received the Junior Certificate or the Bachelor's degree, as they may elect.

"Your committee begs to urge upon the State Board of Education the necessity for issuing temporary credentials valid for not more than two years, during which period the candidate shall be on trial, permanent credentials then to be issued only to such teacher as have done successful work.

"The minimum amount of pedagogy which Section 1521, Sub. 2 (a) directs the State Board of Education to prescribe, is hereby declared to be as follows:

"Satisfactory completion of courses, suitable and essential to acquiring efficient skill in teaching and an intelligent comprehension of the scope, and the attainable goals in high school instruction, said courses to be equivalent to not less than twelve hours per week for one half-year; provided, that at least one-third of this work shall consist of practical teaching under the direction of supervising instructors of academic competency and breadth of pedagogic comprehension who for a period of not less than

two years have taught the subjects in which they supervise.

"The State Board of Education is not authorized by Section 1521 to specify institutions in which prescribed pedagogy may be taken, but as standards of equivalents, the certificate from any institution belonging to the Association of American Universities, or from any California State Normal School, or their recognized equivalents, may be accepted, provided that the recommendation of applicants by faculties of institutions in which the pedagogical courses are pursued, attests that the requirements above stated have been fulfilled.

C.C. Van Liew
Committee

.....

"On motion the report was accepted and placed on file.

"President Wheeler arrived at this point and took his seat in the meeting.

"President Burk moved the adoption of that part of the report which gives the minimum amount of pedagogy required. On roll call the same was adopted by the votes of all members present.

"President Van Liew moved that the four statements of governing principles mentioned in the report be adopted as representing the views of the State Board of Education on high school certification. The motion was unanimously adopted.

"After a general discussion of the report, Pres. Burk moved that Messrs. Millspaugh, Van Liew and Wheeler be appointed a committee to formulate rules in accordance with the recommendations of the conference. The motion carried. The committee was directed to report at its convenience, and the members were then excused from the Board Meeting.

.....

"The Board reconvened at 3 o'clock P.M. with the same members present as at the morning session.

"The report of the committee appointed to formulate rules in accordance with the recommendations of the conference was read by Pres. Van Liew. The report is as follows:

"1. High school certificates may be issued under the provisions of Section 1521, Sub. 2 (a), and Section 1775, 1 (a) of the Political Code of California, as follows:

"To candidates who have received the Bachelor's Degree from a college requiring not less than eight years of high school and college training, and who submit evidence that in addition to the courses required for the Bachelor's Degree, they have successfully completed at least one year of graduate study in a University belonging to the Association of American Universities; which year of graduate study shall include one half-year of advanced academic study (part of the time, at least, being devoted to one or more of the subjects taught in the high school), and such other time in a well-

equipped training school of secondary grade directed by the Department of Education of any one of the Universities of the Association, as may be necessary to fulfill the pedagogical requirements prescribed by this Board.

"2. In lieu of the pedagogical training above prescribed, candidates may submit evidence showing that they are graduates of a California Normal School, or other Normal School officially recognized by this Board as of equivalent rank, or have taught with decided success as regular teachers or as principals at least twenty months in any reputable school, elementary or secondary; and provided that until July 1, 1908, the practical teaching prescribed may have been pursued in schools of grammar grade.

"3. The institution granting the Bachelor's Degree, the institution in which the post-graduate academic study is pursued, and the institution in which the pedagogical work is done, shall each certify to the high character of the work accomplished under its direction, and to the personal fitness of the candidate.

"4. While having no power to legislate in the premises, the Board, in adopting the foregoing conification [sic] of its proposed procedure, does so in the understanding that the University of California and the Leland Stanford Junior University will not recommend their graduates for grammar school certificates, except as those desiring such certifi-

cates shall have received their pedagogical training in connection with a Normal School.

J.F. Millspaugh

C.C. Van Liew

Benj. Ide Wheeler

.....

"On motion of Pres. Van Liew, Rule 1 as read was then adopted on roll call by the following votes:

Ayes -- Dailey, Millspaugh, Van Liew, Wheeler,
Dresslar, Kirk, and Black; 7;

Noes -- none, Burk not voting.

"Rule 2, amended to add, 'or secondary grade in connection with a California State Normal School, or under the direction of the Department of Education of the University of California or of Leland Stanford Junior University, as evidenced by a certificate of proficiency from the authorities thereof,' was adopted.

"Rule 3 was adopted.

"Rule 4 was ordered spread upon the minutes.

"On roll call, on motion of Pres. Dailey, it was ordered that the foregoing rules take effect on August 1, 1906."